DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 204 EA 021 793

AUTHOR	Odden, Allan, R.; Marsh, David D.
TITLE	How State Education Reform Can Improve Secondary Schools, Part II: Background and Technical Appendices. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) Policy Paper.
INSTITUTION	Policy Analysis for California Education, Berkeley, CA.
REPORT NO	PACE-PC87-12-14A-SDE
PUB DATE	Dec 87
NOTE	296p.; For Part I, see EA 021 965. Data tables in appendixes will not reproduce well due to small, filled/broken type.
AVAILABLE FROM	PACE Publications, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720 ($14.00, payable to the Regents of the University of California).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Policy; Educational Quality; *Excellence in Education; High Risk Students; Outcomes of Education; Politics of Education; *Program Implementation; Secondary Education; State School District Relationship; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*California; *Policy Analysis; Senate Bill 813 (California 1983)

ABSTRACT

By June 1983, California enacted Senate Bill 813, a sweeping, comprehensive education reform program that contained over 80 education policy and program reforms. The state legislature asked the research team to analyze schools that were effectively responding to reform stimuli and to identify how Senate Bill 813 aided, hindered, or was irrelevant to local processes of school improvement. Seventeen secondary schools were specially selected for this study. Each site researcher produced qualitative data that answered, for each of 14 state policies, a series of detailed questions about the policy as implemented in the school, the process of implementation, linkage to school and district vision and other state policies, and perceptions of the policy's purpose and substance by teachers and administrators. Additional qualitative data answered detailed quesitons about 23 implementation variables in the conceptual framework. The study found that state improvement efforts in curriculum and instruction can interact with local initiative to improve secondary schools. Local implementation processes are critical to the success of such improvements, and a common local implementation process is successful across schools that differ ethnically, geographically, and demographically. Nine appendixes, which compose almost two-thirds of the report, contain research instruments and data summaries. (MLF)

ED320204

DUCA

Policy Paper No. PC87-12-14A-SDE

How State Education Reform Can Improve Secondary Schools

Allan R. Odden
David D. Marsh

December 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Julia E. Koppich
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 793

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Policy Paper No. PC87-12-14A-SDE

How State Education Reform Can Improve Secondary Schools

Allan R. Odden
David D. Marsh

December 1987

PART II: BACKGROUND AND TECHNICAL APPENDICES

With the assistance of:

Lyle Allison, Greg Bender, John Bowles, Patricia R. Brown, John Evans, James Guthrie, Eric Hartwig, Gerald Hayward, Michael Kirst, Julia Koppich, Donna LeCzel, Michael McQuary, Betty Merchant, Jill Pearson, Marge Plecki, Gloria Roelen, and René Verdin

Allan R. Odden is an associate professor of education at the University of Southern California and director of the Southern California PACE Center.

David D. Marsh is an associate professor of education at the University of Southern California.

This study of school reform implementation was funded in part through a contract with the California State Department of Education.

This paper was sponsored and published by Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE. PACE is funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and directed jointly by James W. Guthrie and Michael W. Kirst. The analyses and conclusions in this paper are those of the authors and are not necessarily endorsed by the Hewlett Foundation.

Additional copies of this paper, PC87-12-14A-SDE, are available by sending $14.00 per copy to:

PACE
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

CHECKS PAYABLE TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
(California residents add appropriate sales tax.)

Policy Paper No. PC87-12-14A-SDE
Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE)
Berkeley, California
December 1987

Contents

Acknowledgments v
Policy Analysis for California Education vii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

The California Strategy: A Fifteen-Year Evolution 2
Impacts of Reform: 1983-1986 3
Purpose of the Study 4
The Research Questions 5
What the Study Was Not 5

CHAPTER 2: APPROACH TO THE STUDY 6

Conceptual Advances in the Study of Program Implementation and Impact 7
- *The Implementation of Government Programs* 7
- *The 1980s Education Reforms Are Different* 8

The Conceptual Framework 11
- *Vision* 11
- *Program Adoption* 12
- *Local Implementation and Change* 13

Critical Elements of the Local Implementation and Change Process 16
1. *Development of an Implementation Plan* 16
2. *Selection of a High Quality, Proven Effective Program* 16
3. *Top-Down v. Bottom-Up Initiation* 16
4. *Central Office Support* 17
5. *Principal Support and Preparation* 17
6. *Cross-Role Teams* 17
7. *Training and Assistance* 18
8. *Continued Top Leadership, Support, and Pressure* 18
9. *Press for Fidelity of Implementation v. Mutual Adaptation* 18

The Variables of Implementation 19
Outcomes 19

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION 21

Sample Selection 22
Data Collection 27
- *State Program Implementation and Local Reform Vision* 29
- *The Local Implementation Process* 29
- *Outcomes* 30
- *Programs for Special Populations* 31

Data Analysis 32

CHAPTER 4: MAJOR FINDINGS 35

Implementation of SB 813 Policies and Programs 38
- *Increased High School Graduation, CSU and UC Entrance Requirements* 38
- *Model Curriculum Standards* 40
- *Changes in Textbooks Adopted* 41
- *CAP and Other New Tests* 42
- *Mentor Teacher Program* 43
- *Certification of Teacher Evaluators and New Teacher Evaluation Systems* 45
- *Other Local Staff Development for Teachers and Administrators* 46
- *School Improvement Program* 48
- *Homework Policies* 49
- *Tenth Grade Counseling* 50
- *Longer School Day and Longer School Year Incentives* 50
- *Quality Indicators* 51

Implementation Phases 52

Improving the Curriculum and Enhancing Instruction 53

Critical Factors for Improving Schools: The Local Implementation Process 54

Student, Personnel, and School Outcomes 56

Special Student Populations 57

Relationship of Outcomes to Process Variables 58
- *The Story of CAP Score Improvement* 58
- *Improved Organizational Capacity* 61

Toward a More Complex Reform Agenda 64

Policy Implications and Suggestions 65

APPENDICES 67

Appendix A: Implementation of State Policies Research Instruments 67

Appendix B: Local Implementation Research Instruments 89

Appendix C: Outcomes Research Instruments 117

Appendix D: Special Populations Research Instruments 139

Appendix E: Outcomes 143

Appendix F: Senate Bill 813 Policies 149

Appendix G: Implementation Variables 173

Appendix H: Special-Needs Students Program Characteristics 215

Appendix I: Explanations for Outcomes 227

Acknowledgments

This study was made possible only by extraordinary cooperation among numerous individuals, state agencies, local school districts, the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford University, and the University of Southern California.

First, we extend appreciation and thanks to the superintendents, central office staff, principals, building administrators, teachers, and students who opened their districts, schools, and education reform processes to the research team with thoughtfulness and candor. They generously gave of their time, energy, and knowledge; and the entire study is indebted to them.

Second, we thank Robert Harris, Diane Cummings, and Bernard Kalscheuer from the State Department of Finance; Hal Geiogue and Ray Reinhard from the Legislative Analyst's Office, and James Smith and William Padia from the State Department of Education. These individuals and agencies supported the study throughout and gave counsel and advice to the research team.

Third, we are grateful to our colleagues at PACE for their contributions and analyses. In particular, we would like to express our gratitude to:

- James Guthrie, Gerald Hayward, John Evans, and graduate students Julia Koppich, Eric Hartwig, Marge Plecki, Donna LeCzel, Greg Bender, and René Verdin from UC Berkeley
- Michael Kirst and graduate student Betty Merchant from Stanford
- Graduate students Jill Pearson, Lyle Allison, Michael McQuary, Gloria Roelen, and John Bowles from USC
- Patricia R. Brown, a private consultant and political scientist

These individuals spent many days conducting fieldwork, writing and synthesizing findings, and participating in meetings at USC.

Fourth, we were helped enormously throughout by Stacy Payne, administrative assistant at USC, on whose shoulders fell administrative, logistical, and secretarial functions. We thank Stacy for her hard work and for never missing a deadline, for her psychological support, for her poems and odes, and for her good humor.

We also express our appreciation to the UC Berkeley Policy Seminar which provided separate funding for a fiscal analysis related to this study, and to Helen Cagampang who conducted this portion of the study.

The quality of the study and its findings must be shared with all these individuals. All shortcomings rest on our shoulders.

Allan R. Odden and David D. Marsh
University of Southern California
December 1987

Policy Analysis for California Education

Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, is a university-based research center focusing on issues of state educational policy and practice. PACE is located in the Schools of Education at the University of California, Berkeley and Stanford University. It is funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and directed jointly by James W. Guthrie and Michael W. Kirst. PACE operates satellite centers in Sacramento and Southern California. These are directed by Gerald C. Hayward (Sacramento) and Allan R. Odden (University of Southern California).

PACE efforts center on five tasks: (1) collecting and distributing objective information about the conditions of education in California, (2) analyzing state educational policy issues and the policy environment, (3) evaluating school reforms and state educational practices, (4) providing technical support to policy makers, and (5) facilitating discussion of educational issues.

The PACE research agenda is developed in consultation with public officials and staff. In this way, PACE endeavors to address policy issues of immediate concern and to fill the short-term needs of decision makers for information and analysis.

PACE publications include Policy Papers, which report research findings; the Policy Forum, which presents views of notable individuals; and Update, an annotated list of all PACE papers completed and in progress.

Advisory Board

Mario Camara
  Partner
  Cox, Castle & Nicholson

Constance Carroll
  President, Saddleback
  Community College

Gerald Foster
  Region Vice President
  Pacific Bell

Robert Maynard
  Editor and President
  The Oakland Tribune

A. Alan Post
  California Legislative Analyst,
  Retired

Sharon Schuster
  Executive Vice President
  American Association of University Women

Eugene Webb
  Professor, Graduate School of Business
  Stanford University

Aaron Wildavsky
  Professor of Political Science
  University of California, Berkeley

Chapter 1

Introduction

In the early 1980s, a study of California secondary students' pathways through high school documented an erosion in secondary school curriculum. Electives had replaced academic courses; student exposure to sound mathematics, science, and U.S. history had dropped; and courses taken to graduate from high school failed to aggregate into a clear body of knowledge.

In 1982, the California Business Roundtable proposed a series of reforms to remedy these system declines. Also in 1982, Bill Honig, then a member of the State Board of Education, won election to the office of superintendent of public instruction. His platform included a common core curriculum for all students, stiffer requirements for high school graduation, tougher academic standards, and better school discipline. In early 1983, State Senator Gary K. Hart , Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes, and State Superintendent Bill Honig unveiled comprehensive proposals for education reform.

These California-initiated education reform efforts were bolstered in April 1983 by the release of *A Nation at Risk*, a report to the U.S. Secretary of Education that proposed major school change along dimensions similar to the California proposals. *A Nation at Risk* called for increased high school graduation requirements, a new core academic curriculum, stricter standards, and longer school days and years. This report was followed by a flurry of other national reports proposing comprehensive school reforms.

California responded swiftly. By June 1983, the legislature had enacted and the governor had signed Senate Bill 813, a sweeping, comprehensive education reform program. The bill contained over 80 education policy and program reforms, from finance structures to curriculum and instructional issues. The goal of the reform was to improve local schools. For each of the next four years, an additional $1 billion was appropriated to boost funding for the overall education system and reform programs.

Between 1984 and 1986, several studies produced information indicating that the California reforms were "working," but most of these studies relied on survey or statewide aggregate data. They left unanswered questions about what reform programs really looked like in local schools, whether local schools actually were implementing substantive quality improvements, and how the improvement process worked. The study described in this report was undertaken to ascertain whether and how state-level education reform initiatives could improve local schools.

The California Strategy: A Fifteen-Year Evolution

Senate Bill 813 is California's most recent foray into comprehensive education policy. Including education programs enacted in the 15 years before Senate Bill 813, California now has a relatively complex set of policies that include a heavy dose of both top-down and bottom-up strategies and are targeted at both the regular curriculum and programs for students with special needs. For both the regular curriculum program and traditional categorical programs for low-achieving, low-income, and limited-English-proficient students, California has adopted an extensive and rich compliance and program improvement orientation.

California's school improvement strategy has been to improve the content of the regular curriculum and instructional program and to make mastery of this program the goal for *all* students. The key elements of this strategy were embodied in Senate Bill 813—increased high school graduation requirements, model curriculum standards, new California Assessment Program (CAP) tests, and longer days and years—and subsequent State Department of Education initiatives—new science, mathematics, and social studies curriculum frameworks; strengthened textbook adoption criteria; and revised School Improvement (SI) program quality review criteria.

For students with special needs, the state has retained its set of categorical programs but refocused them with new regulations and streamlined their administrative structures. By regulation, it requires that services provided under categorical programs help eligible students master the regular curriculum program, not a different curriculum. California is betting that quality education for all students turns on the quality of the main curriculum program and that the quality of every other program hinges on that. Further, California created a consolidated categorical program application form that reduces local paper work, and it implemented a coordinated compliance review system in which all major categorical programs are monitored for compliance simultaneously once every three years.

To create a bottom-up mechanism, the state expanded the SI program and required new site improvement programs to focus on a quality curriculum program and to align categorical services with the new curriculum. Further, the legislature eliminated the state role in substantive review of local site education improvement plans, shifting that responsibility to local central district offices. The state delegated external review of SI program implementation to consortia of local educators. Finally, the state required districts to engage in bottom-up activities to transform state directives into local school visions.

Thus, California has created a broad framework for what constitutes a sound core academic curriculum program, has moved to align categorical program services to that curriculum, and has streamlined and focused regulatory compliance. It has delegated to the local level responsibility for determining the details of how the broad curriculum and special-needs services would be tailored to local site and district needs, and it has engaged local educators in reviewing the programs as implemented and their impacts on students.

Impacts of Reform: 1983-1986

Several studies in 1985 and 1986 provided encouraging evidence that the California quality improvement initiatives in Senate Bill 813 were having their intended impacts.[1] In addition, the State Department of Education's Quality Indicators, which provided information on student attendance and dropout rates, scores on CAP and nationally normed tests, and enrollments in academic and advanced placement courses, documented improvements in all areas and further showed that progress exceeded initial targets for change. A small study even suggested that education reform could be compatible with the emphasis on special students that had developed in the previous decade.[2]

Nevertheless, the scope of Senate Bill 813's proposed changes had no previous parallel. At the most fundamental level, it represented a return to conventional wisdom, a set of aspirations intended to restore California's education system to a former level of achievement and academic rigor. The bill's many ideas for school improvement, if implemented, potentially could alter the curriculum and instructional practices of virtually every school in the state. However, despite the bill's sweeping scope and the large accompanying revenue increases, it included neither a proven effective reform philosophy nor a cohesive school change strategy.

A major question was whether districts could implement Senate Bill 813's provisions in a systematic manner. Also, little was known about the interactive effects of such a large number of reform ideas being implemented simultaneously. Could local school districts and schools cope with this level of complexity? In short, after all the excitement of enactment and knowledge of some programs' implementation, a question remained: could local districts weld together Senate Bill 813's disparate provisions into a coherent and forceful set of tools for school improvement?

---

[1] James W. Guthrie and Michael W. Kirst (eds.), *Conditions of Education in California, 1985* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, 1985). Pam Grossman, Michael Kirst, Worku Negash, and Jackie Schmidt-Posner, *Curricular Change in California Comprehensive High Schools: 1982-83 to 1984-85* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, 1985). Carole L. Swain, *SB 813 and Tenth Grade Counseling: A Report on Implementation* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, 1985). Loren Kaye, *Making the Grade? Assessing School Districts' Progress on SB 813* (Sacramento: California Tax Foundation, April 1985).

[2] Allan Odden, "Education Reform and Services to Poor Students: Can the Two Policies be Compatible?" *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 9 (3) Fall 1987: 231-244.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to understand how selected California schools reacted to state school improvement inducements and mandates. Specifically, the study assessed whether or not reform components contained in Senate Bill 813 could contribute to school improvement, and if so, how?

The state legislature asked the research team to analyze schools that were effectively responding to reform stimuli, to identify how Senate Bill 813 was transformed locally into school improvement visions, to describe the local implementation of that vision, and to identify how Senate Bill 813 aided, hindered, or was irrelevant to local processes of school improvement. In response, the current study was designed:

- to describe how the individual Senate Bill 813 policies looked in local schools that were actively engaged in the processes of improvement
- to portray how state education reform policy implementation was affected by the local educational, economic, political, and demographic context
- to demonstrate how state education reform policy specifically interacted with the local district vision of education quality, both in terms of helping to define that vision as well as being modified by that vision
- to ascertain how substantive state education leadership interacted with substantive district education leadership, and how the combination interacted with school site leadership, the local organizational unit responsible for putting a vision into place
- to show how school site and district activities combined to implement successfully a vision and program designed to improve a secondary school
- to identify the impacts on the curriculum, teachers, students, administrators, and the school as an organization

The study also was designed to collect data on how the redistributive programs from the 1970s—remedial, compensatory, limited-English-proficient, and at-risk student programs—both affected the local vision of reform and were incorporated into the implementation processes, i.e., to identify interactions between redistributive programs (that had been fully implemented) and new developmental programs as they were being implemented. Information was sought on whether, and if so how, education excellence pushed aside education equity.

The Research Questions

Based on case studies in 17 secondary schools, the study was designed to answer the following seven specific questions:

1. How have key Senate Bill 813 policies been implemented in secondary schools?

2. What are the key local factors associated with successful implementation of the goals of Senate Bill 813?

3. What elements of Senate Bill 813 (or other state policies) are strongly and positively linked to the key local factors, what elements hinder successful local reform, and what elements are unmentioned or unnoticed?

4. How have California's education reforms affected (a) the curriculum program in secondary schools; (b) the content knowledge and instructional skills of teachers; (c) the curricular and instructional leadership skills of administrators; (d) the structure, climate, and nature of schools as organizations and places in which to teach and learn; and (e) the knowledge and performance of students?

5. How have schools used resources—fiscal and other—to implement education reform? (This component of the study was funded separately by the California Policy Seminar, and the results are reported in a separate document.)

6. How have special student populations—low achiever, poor, limited-English-proficient, and at risk of dropping out—been treated in local reform and quality improvement implementation?

7. What do the study results suggest for modifications and additions to state policies? Which elements of Senate Bill 813 or other state policies should be strengthened, which reduced, and what new programs might be needed?

What the Study Was Not

Before describing the study and its findings, it is important to clarify what the study did not do. Education is important in California. Literally billions of dollars, millions of students, and thousands of employees are directly involved. The long-run condition of the state and the well-being of its citizens depend on school quality. Every responsible person wants California's schools to be more effective. Thus, the financial and political investment in school reforms is intense. Some would like to declare Senate Bill 813 a great success in order to justify added state resources for public schools. Others would like to declare Senate Bill 813 a failure and, thereby, deny education added revenues or argue for another reform strategy altogether.

At least from these perspectives, both parties will be disappointed in this study. Its purpose was not to judge the overall effectiveness of Senate Bill 813. True enough, students' average statewide test scores have risen since Senate Bill 813's enactment. But that is insufficient evidence by itself to claim victory for school reform. Assessing the effectiveness statewide of a comprehensive school change plan would have required resources far in excess of those spent on this study and a quite different research strategy. Appraising outcomes and judging whether or not they were caused by Senate Bill 813 would have meant the use of a large sample of schools selected to be representative of the awesome size and diversity of California. Half that sample would have had to have received a reform "treatment" while attempting to hold the other half of the sample relatively constant on important dimensions. Only in an experimental design such as this could there be a reasonable control for outside or competing explanations for school change. Such experiments are difficult to conduct in education generally and impossible in this instance.[3]

In contrast, this study utilized a purposive, rather than representative, sample of 17 secondary schools known to be in the process of becoming academically more rigorous. Important lessons were learned as a result. However, based solely on the selection of schools, results are not meant to be representative of school experiences statewide. "Sample" in this case refers only to the 17 secondary schools specially selected for this study.

Did Senate Bill 813 bring about school reform in California? Is the state receiving its money's worth in terms of added school productivity? What components of Senate Bill 813 make the biggest difference? These questions cannot be answered by the research reported here. Moreover, it may be that given the relatively short period of time during which Senate Bill 813 has been in effect and the complexity of the interactions involved in the reform provisions, few definitive differences would yet be detectable, regardless of the research design employed.

However, to assert that there are research questions and important policy concerns unaddressed by this study, to invoke caveats, should not tarnish the important research findings the study provides. This analytic endeavor resulted in several major findings all of which are significant to policy makers. Before explaining these findings, however, it is necessary to describe the substantive approach to the study and the research procedures used.

---

[3] A quasi-experimental time series design might also have been appropriate, but that was not possible either. This study, though not assessing effectiveness, attempted to compensate for the absense of longitudinal data by using retrospective interviews where appropriate.

Chapter 2

Approach to the Study

Over the last decade, several important advances in knowledge have been made about both the content and processes for improving schools. These advances strongly influenced the analytic approach used in this study. This chapter summarizes these knowledge advances, then describes their implications for the study. Next, the elements of the conceptual framework that guided this study are discussed. The conceptual framework itself includes both content and local process variables that are important for improving education. Finally, a series of variables is presented that attempts to integrate key state policy initiatives and local implementation elements.

Conceptual Advances in the Study of Program Implementation and Impact

The Implementation of Government Programs

Recent research on state and federal governmental programs demonstrates that these programs become implemented over time, operate with fidelity to rules and regulations, and function at least at minimal levels of effectiveness. Several 1980s' studies of categorical program implementation represent the research making this case for education.[1] A recent book by Peterson, Rabe and Wong, *When Federalism Works*, essentially makes the same case for governmental programs across several functional areas, including education.[2] In addition, the book outlines a new theory of implementation which holds that redistributive programs, i.e., programs (such as compensatory education) designed to provide more services to some local clients (often the poor) than to others, initially have more difficulty in reaching full implementation because, at the beginning, a higher level of government is "forcing" a new set of priorities onto a local government. Initial, strong, local resistance to this higher-level governmental intrusion, however, gives way over time through a mutual accommodation process in which both levels of government work to structure a program that is acceptable to each. The modified program finally is implemented. On the other hand, developmental programs, which tend to augment local programs in which local governments are engaged anyway (e.g., improving curriculum and instruction), experience a less contentious implementation process in large part because they reinforce rather than redirect local priorities, thus they produce less local resistance.

---

[1] Mary Moore, Margaret Goertz, and Terry Hartle, *The Interactions of Federal and Related State Education Programs* (Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, February 1983). Michael S. Knapp, Marian S. Stearns, Brenda J. Turnbull, Jane L. David, and Susan M. Peterson, *Cumulative Effects of Federal Education Policies on Schools and Districts* (Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, January 1983). Richard Jung and Michael Kirst, "Beyond Mutual Adaptation, Into the Bully Pulpit: Recent Research on the Federal Role in Education," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 22 (3) Summer 1986: 80-109. The series of studies of the most recent study of Chapter I, which are just now being released, essentially reach the same conclusions as these studies.

[2] Paul E. Peterson, Barry G. Rabe, and Kenneth K.Wong, *When Federalism Works* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1986).

While many pundits were skeptical about successful state education reform implementation, the above theory predicted that such programs would be implemented expeditiously. First, improving the regular education program had been a key state education function and was viewed by the states as their primary education function.[3] Thus, state education reform initiatives had a surface validity. Second, state education reform programs were really versions of education developmental programs. Thus, from the above theory, one would predict fairly rapid, on-target, and relatively uncontested local implementation. While differing in perhaps detail, state education reform programs in large part reinforced activities in which local districts already were, or wished to be, engaged.

These advances in knowledge focused the current study on the substance and processes of implementation, and away from concern about whether local settings would continually resist state initiatives. At the same time, these advances implied that local districts would transform state initiatives into locally internalized visions of improvement. Consequently, the study also focused on the local transformation process. Finally, the view that education reform likely would be rapidly implemented, compared to the equity initiatives of the past, drove the study to examine how advanced implementation occurred and what effects full implementation had on an array of outcomes.

The 1980s Education Reforms Are Different

While the richness of local education reform implementation activities could be anticipated, school reforms in the 1980s were substantively different from those in the 1960s and 1970s. Thus a study of their implementation and impact needed to be conceptualized and conducted differently. School reforms of the 1960s and 1970s usually were discrete programs often targeted on specific student groups, such as the disadvantaged, handicapped, or gifted. Funding sources were separate, and dollars were "tracked" to the school. In classrooms, teachers had to identify target students and provide the extra services only to them. Further, programs were structured (usually by "pulling-out" target students) so that services supplemented and did not supplant base program services.

---

[3] Ann M. Milne, Jay Moskowitz, and Fran M. Ellman, *Serving Special Needs Children: The State Approach* (Washington, DC: Decision Resources, February 1983).

Studies of the implementation and impact of these programs identified how the programs were conceived in the state (or the nation's) capital, then followed the delivery of the program down through the education system from the legislature, to the State Department of Education, to the local school district, to the school, and finally into the classroom. At district and school levels, implementation research assessed the degree of compliance with rules and regulations and general purposes of the program. Such research, though, tended not to analyze the integration of the program into the ongoing or regular program of the school. This type of research generally was adequate for the special-needs students programs created in the 1960s and 1970s. In the 1980s, however, issues of quality were raised for these kinds of programs, and the general response was that their quality depended on the degree to which they were integrated into the regular district/school program.[4]

Further, since numerous categorical programs were designed in the 1960s and 1970s, there often were multiple target groups of students in one classroom, with many students eligible for services from more than one program. To analyze the implementation and impact of all of these programs, the concepts of aggregate and cumulative effects emerged. Cumulative effects were the total effects of all the various programs on individuals or groups of students. Aggregate effects were the resultant strategies schools developed to administer multiple programs within a total school program, which ranged from integrated and coherent to fragmented and incoherent. The aggregate and cumulative effects approach was a sound way to assess the impact of several, separate programs on individuals and groups of students within a single school, as long as the individual programs remained the points of concern.

The 1980s education reforms, including California's Senate Bill 813, were more comprehensive in structure and intent than even the multiplicity of categorical programs of the 1970s. An even broader conceptual framework than aggregate and cumulative effects was needed to analyze the implementation and impact of such education reforms. It would have been difficult, if not impossible, just to follow Senate Bill 813 reforms down through the system in a traditional implementation and impact study. In schools, many reforms lost their specific identity and "appeared" only as major changes in the general, core education program. Moreover, the effect of other reforms hinged on changes in the general education program and on changes in the nature of the school as an organization. Further, since the goal of Senate Bill 813 was to improve local schools, providing information only on how particular programs "looked" in a school (the trees of Senate Bill 813) would not provide information on whether schools had become more effective (the forest of Senate Bill 813).

---

[4] See, for example, Allan Odden, "How Fiscal Accountability and Program Quality Can be Insured for Chapter I," chapter prepared for a forthcoming book on Chapter I edited by Denis Doyle; and Richard Elmore and Milbrey McLaughlin, "Strategic Choice in Federal Policy: The Compliance-Assistance Trade-Off," in Ann Lieberman and Milbrey McLaughlin (eds.) *Policymaking in Education* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1981, 151-194).

Finally, the task locally was to take the state reform mandates and other initiatives and weave them into a local strategy to change and improve schools over several years.

Another critical feature of new education reforms in the 1980s was their increased emphasis on education substance. In the 1970s, states sometimes stimulated education improvement activities but gave local schools and districts extensive latitude for defining program substance. In recent years, states have taken stronger leadership roles in defining substantive, education directions and strengthened the partnership with districts as well as individual schools in adapting that direction to local circumstances. Specifically, reform efforts in California and across the country emphasized the intricate but important relationships among curriculum goals, textbooks, instructional strategies, and testing programs, which are seen as the core elements of a quality education system.

The substance of Senate Bill 813 and related state policy initiatives can be summarized as three broad goals for education. These goals, which include the elements of a quality education system, are as follows:

1. To improve the curriculum program in schools, i.e., to identify a core academic program, to improve the substantive depth of the courses that composed that program, to strengthen textbooks, and to ensure greater curricular alignment (of instructional objectives, teaching materials, and tests) and articulation (across grade levels and programs).

2. To improve the skills and performance of individuals—students, teachers, and administrators—within schools, i.e., to improve the academic achievement of students in basic, content-area skills, to improve the instructional effectiveness of teachers, and to improve the instructional leadership of administrators.

3. To improve schools as institutions, i.e., to develop in all schools the characteristics and climates associated with effective schools.

The view that 1980s education reforms were fundamentally different from the student-targeted programs of the past led to two important aspects of the study's design. First, state policies can be powerful influences on the overall local education program. Thus, the policy initiatives are best studied for their contributions generally to local system improvement rather than just as individual entities to which districts must simply comply. Second, effective state policies must operate in combination and be synergistic rather than competitive or contradictory. Thus, the study focused on the contribution of each individual state policy to local education improvement (the trees of Senate Bill 813) but more importantly on the combined effect of these state initiatives on the local educational system (the forest of Senate Bill 813).

In short, for studying the forest of Senate Bill 813, it was viewed as a strategy to upgrade the overall local education system by seeking (a) to improve what was taught in schools, (b) to improve the skills and knowledge of individuals who learned and worked in schools, and (c) to improve schools themselves as social organizations.

The Conceptual Framework

To develop a conceptual framework that captured individual Senate Bill 813 reforms themselves, as well as this more comprehensive view of state education reform, and integrated macro program implementation with micro local school change, a comprehensive review of the literature was conducted, drawing heavily upon the curriculum alignment, effective schools, program implementation, and local education change research. The intent was to use a conceptual framework that incorporated the elements of local education system improvement as well as traditional implementation concepts.[5] The goal was to have a framework that could be used both to understand and study the interactions between state and district policy initiatives *and* effective local site improvement activities.

Vision

The local focus of study had to be the implementation of both individual provisions of Senate Bill 813 and implementation of the local district or school vision of education quality. The study had to capture the degree to which, and how, state education reform programs and policies became part of a local vision for education excellence. The vision at the district and school levels needed to be analyzed separately from state reform initiatives. Issues at this stage included both the degree to which state programs helped determine the substance of local visions of excellence, and how strong, *a priori*, local visions incorporated or wove into their fabric of excellence the substance of state initiatives.

An additional point addressed by the conceptual framework was that the definition of education reform seemed also to be evolving and expanding, even as the study was conducted. Studies of local visions, their incorporation of state programs and policies, and their integrated implementation needed to differentiate between which "phase" of reform was being studied. While there was no widely accepted definition of reform phases, four general phases were identified, and the study assumed that implementation might vary for each:

---

[5] Michael Knapp and Marian Stearns, "Improving Systemwide Performance: Evaluation Research and State Education Reform Programs," in Joseph Wholey, Mark Abramson, and Christopher Bellavita (eds.) *Performance and Credibility: Developing Excellence in Public and NonPublic Organizations* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986).

Phase 1	Higher standards, increased high school graduation requirements, basic skills tests, more traditional academic courses, more homework, a return to the "traditional" good high school
Phase 2	Better courses, new model curriculum standards, better textbooks, curriculum alignment, beginnings of new teacher roles, education program quality indicators, reduction in dropouts
Phase 3	More radical curriculum change, curriculum integration across content areas, greater emphasis on writing and communication, higher order thinking skills, problem solving skills, broader uses of technology, interpersonal small group skills
Phase 4	Teacher professionalism, teacher decision making, national standards board, career ladders, policy trust agreements to augment traditional collective bargaining, restructured schools, more parental choice, system incentives, merit schools

This concept of the substance of reform had several implications for the study's design. First, the study was designed to analyze the linkage between the substance of reform, including the local reform vision, and the local implementation process. Second, the study defined different phases of California's reforms and analyzed somewhat separately the implementation processes for each wave. Third, the study examined the impacts of each phase on the three broad goals of reform described above.

Program Adoption

Once a local vision was defined for a specific phase, the issue became the implementation of that local vision. While the school was the focal point for study, the district was the unit of analysis, in order to capture the important and key roles districts played in stimulating and supporting local site education reform.

To study the adoption process for both individual Senate Bill 813 provisions and local (district and site) visions of education excellence, a traditional implementation framework was used. Information was gathered on critical dimensions of each local Senate Bill 813 program and local reform vision, on how those key dimensions were informed by local educational, political, and demographic issues, on who the key actors were in the local implementation process, and on the major events in the local adoption process.

But while this analysis sufficed for macro implementation research, i.e., for studying how state programs penetrated local districts, that was only the first step—the adoption phase—of the local improvement and education change process. And, while prior to the 1980s, the adoption process was the focus of most education change studies, adoption now is viewed as only the first in at least four stages of the complex and long-term local change, education improvement process.

Local Implementation and Change

Historically, the literature on the sociology of organizational change focused on organizational structures,[6] the culture of the school,[7] and the school as a workplace.[8] This literature provided substantial insight into schools as organizations, but it provided little insight about how schools could be restructured so as to enhance improvements in education programs.

Another strand of the literature on organizational sociology explored how organizations adopted and implemented education improvements. In the 1970s, these studies focused on the adoption and implementation of federally funded innovations. The RAND study[9] helped to explain the process by which local schools changed innovative ideas and adapted them to meet the organizational conditions of the local context. Lieberman and Rosenholtz[10] summarized the specific factors important to successful implementation as including, "concrete staff training, classroom assistance, teacher observations of similar projects, teacher participation in project decision, principal participation in new learnings and, in some cases, the development of materials locally." Fullan[11] provided a synthesis of these factors.

---

[6] For example, see James G. March (ed.) *Handbook of Organizations* (Skokie, Il: Rand McNally, 1965). J. Victor Baldridge and Terrence Deal (eds.) *Managing Change in Educational Organizations* (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975).

[7] Seymour Sarason, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change* (2nd edition) (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982). Dan Lortie, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975). Philip A. Cusick, *The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School* (New York: Longman, 1983).

[8] Robert Dreeben, *The Nature of Teaching: Schools and the Work of Teachers* (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1970).

[9] Paul Berman and Milbrey McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change* (8 vols.) (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1978). Milbrey McLaughlin and David Marsh, "Staff Development and School Change," *Teachers College Record*, 80 (1978): 69-93.

[10] Ann Lieberman and Susan Rosenholtz, "The Road to School Improvement," in John Goodlad (ed.) *The Ecology of School Renewal* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

Huberman and Miles,[12] drawing from their case studies in the Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) study, extended the literature on factors related to successful implementation of innovations in several important ways. First, they identified causal networks of factors related to successful implementation. These networks portrayed the relationship between factors over a period ranging from initiation of the change process to institutionalization of the dynamics of the change process. Huberman and Miles illustrated how configurations of assistance were created and carried out as well as the influence of this assistance on teachers as they implemented innovations. They also attempted to demonstrate powerful relationships between major factors such as how pressure to implement and assistance are related. Finally, Huberman and Miles showed how patterns of implementation were related to various types of outcomes of the change process such as stable use of the innovation and institutionalization of the innovation.

However, identifying causal networks of implementation factors is a conceptually complex task. And though Huberman and Miles made a good first attempt, questions remain about the the best way a causal network is constructed. The evaluation of reform implementation in secondary schools described in this report garnered from Huberman and Miles a series of variables worth examining at different stages of implementation.

A third strand of the education change literature examined the development and consequences of having a professional culture among teachers in schools. The proposals contained in *Who Will Teach Our Children* and *A Nation Prepared*[13] build on work by scholars regarding the nature and value of a professional culture for teachers.[14] This culture includes norms of collegiality and improvement, a common technical language about curriculum and instruction, and a willingness to experiment. Other dimensions of the proposals include the development of career ladders and differentiated roles for lead teachers, career incentives, professional control of licensure, and a new climate of teacher decision making and responsibility in schools.

---

[11] Michael Fullan, *The Meaning of Educational Change* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1982).

[12] Michael Huberman and Matthew Miles, *Innovation Up Close* (New York: Plenum, 1984).

[13] California Commission on the Teaching Profession, *Who Will Teach Our Children?* (Sacramento, CA: California Commission on the Teaching Profession, November 1985). Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum, 1986).

[14] Phillip Schlechty and Betty Crowell, *Staff Development and School Improvement: A School District Examines Its Potential for Excellence* (Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, n.d.). Judith Warren Little, Priscilla Galagarian, and O'Neal, *Professional Development Roles and Relationships: Principles and Skills of Advising* (San Francisco: Far West Regional Educational Laboratory, 1984). Ann Lieberman and Susan Rosenholtz, "The Road to School Improvement"; and Ann Lieberman (ed.), *Developing a Professional Culture in School Settings*, (forthcoming).

These three literatures identified key factors involved in successful local change efforts, although there were different understandings about the precise role each of these factors play.

One key area of difference concerned the issues of *commitment and initiation.* Conventional wisdom, including the Rand study, held that teacher commitment must be built "up-front" usually by involving teachers in identifying the change focus, in selecting the change program, and in developing materials. The argument was that this initial involvement developed teacher commitment to the change program itself. More recent change research, including the Huberman and Miles work, found that teacher commitment often emerged at the end of the implementation cycle when teachers have gained mastery over the skills needed to implement the new program and see that the program improved student performance. This research suggested that teacher commitment came *after* skills mastery and *after* teachers saw that the program "worked."

While the findings seemed in conflict, they differed only at the margins. First, *all studies identified teacher commitment as absolutely necessary to successful education change efforts.* At the time of the Rand study, there were few high quality, proven-effective programs, so up-front involvement of teachers in identifying topics to address and in developing materials was crucial to initiating change efforts. But Rand also found that teacher skills mastery and positive program effects on students were necessary for complete implementation and institutionalization.

There also were two different kinds of commitment: commitment to try the new program and commitment to the new program. *Commitment to try* needed to be developed up-front; without it, teachers would not become engaged in trying to implement the program. This type of commitment was probably built through awareness sessions on what the program intended and in responding to teachers' personal concerns about how the program might affect them individually. *Commitment to the program* usually emerged at the end of the implementation process as teachers developed the skills needed to implement the new program and saw that it, indeed, resolved the problem to which it was applied, i.e., that it "worked."

Another key difference between the newest research and the Rand study concerned initiation, i.e., whether teachers needed to be involved in the initiation process in order for the change effort to be successful. Most recent research found that top-down initiation could work if (1) the focus of the change effort was on core education issues that needed improvement, like curriculum, pedagogy, and student performance (the focus of state education reform); (2) a high quality, proven-effective program that "worked" was selected; (3) lots of assistance was provided to teachers throughout the implementation process to help them get the new program "in place"; and (4) administrators stayed involved in supporting the program, technically and symbolically, until it was fully implemented. Teacher involvement in initiation also could work.

Critical Elements of the Local Implementation and Change Process

Insights about the implementation process described above have been synthesized into a conceptual framework which guided this study. The critical elements of this conceptual framework are summarized below.

1. Development of an Implementation Plan

Change is a complicated, long-term process. It is not an event. To be successful, it needs to be planned and managed well. The plan needs to identify the target(s) of change; provide a reasonable time frame (6 to 24 months); identify and allocate resources sufficient to implement the plan; delineate specifically the roles of central office staff, site administrators, and teachers; sequence and schedule events.

2. Selection of a High Quality, Proven Effective Program

Through several federal and state programs, many programs have been developed for a variety of education problems and have been proven effective in a number of different contexts. In short, for most school problems, there are programs "out there" that could remedy the problem. Developing one's own program is time consuming and costly and runs the risk of producing a "dud"; teachers develop commitment only when a program "works." Thus, using a high quality, proven-effective program that "fits" the local school problem will tend to increase the likelihood of a successful change effort. Several aspects of Senate Bill 813 and subsequent State Department of Education initiatives could be included under this heading.

3. Top-Down v. Bottom-Up Initiation

While it is helpful if teachers can be and are involved in the initiation process, top-down initiation also can work. The risk associated with bottom-up initiation is that a problem area could be selected which does not match with central office or state priorities; indeed, many failures of the organizational development approach to change is that top managers often ignore the issues selected or identified by those at the "bottom." The risk with top-down initiation is that teachers may never commit to attempting the change program. Recent research concludes that top-down initiation can work if the area targeted for improvement concerns core education issues such as curriculum, improved teaching, and improved student performance; is followed immediately by heavy teacher involvement in determining implementation specifics; is accompanied by lots of technical assistance throughout the change process; and produces expected impacts on teachers and students.

4. *Central Office Support*

However initiated, successful change efforts need top-level, central office support to move into the complete implementation and institutionalization stages. This support needs to be both symbolic and technical. It needs to include the provision of resources—money, people, and time—and on-going "staying power." A districtwide, or at least district-supported, school-specific plan for implementation is needed. A central office program coordinator is another tangible sign of central office support. Since institutionalization requires organizational and district structural change, at least to some degree, top-level district support and commitment is needed.

5. *Principal Support and Preparation*

Site principals also need to be both supportive of and knowledgeable about the change effort. Principals need to know the content of the change effort, and they need to develop skills for their roles in implementing that effort. The two are different and strongly related. Principals manage schools, allocate scarce school resources and identify school priorities. Schools also need long-term implementation plans to accomplish a successful change effort. Again, to enter the complete implementation and institutionalization stages, top support of site administrators is key.

6. *Cross-Role Teams*

Teachers must be heavily involved in all details of implementing education change. They are the technical experts, and it is their lives that are affected. Cross-role teams are committees of teachers, department heads, site administrators, and central office staff that plan, coordinate, and even help manage implementation activities. Cross-role teams not only develop teacher-teacher collegiality but also teacher-administrator collegiality. Both provide the informal alignment associated with successful change efforts. All studies identified teams of administrators and teachers that worked on the specifics of site implementation as critical to both short- and long-term success. If initiation is top-down, cross-role teams are even more important and must begin work immediately after the start decision.

7. *Training and Assistance*

Successful change does not occur unless there is substantial training and long-term assistance, both technical and psychological. The assistance can be provided from within the school, from the district central office, or by consultants outside the school. High quality, up-front training in the skills needed to begin implementation is important. Follow-through training, ongoing assistance, observation, feedback, and coaching, however, are the *sine qua non* of successful change efforts. Without follow through assistance, skills mastery is unlikely to occur, and teacher commitment thus will not emerge. Follow-through assistance and training should be at least two to three times that of up-front or initial training. The types of assistance and training should change over time as the change effort moves through the various stages/phases of implementation.

8. *Continued Top Leadership, Support, and Pressure*

"Sticking with" the uneventful details of long-term implementation requires "staying power" and pressure. Learning new skills requires the expenditure of effort by teachers. Initial enthusiasm often wanes after the euphoria of initial implementation and the reality of hard work become apparent. Thus, school leaders need to maintain pressure to continue the program, need themselves to stay heavily involved in implementation efforts, and need to be liberal in the provision of the supports and assistance teachers need to develop skills mastery. This is a critical stage for most change efforts. This type of staying power is sustained by complementary central office and site administrator press. This type of formal alignment gives consistent messages to teachers about the priority of the change effort and its fit with strategic directions of the district and school.

9. *Press for Fidelity of Implementation v. Mutual Adaptation*

High quality, proven-effective programs cannot be "watered down" under the guise of "mutual adaptation." To be successful, i.e., to produce the intended effects on student performance, all critical elements of proven-effective programs need to be implemented.

Press for fidelity, thus, is a new element of successful change efforts. Adaptation occurs but more in how the program fits within the school or district system; mutual adaptation of the "dummying down" variety is associated with less successful implementation and few intended impacts on students and teachers.

The Variables of Implementation

Individual elements of the implementation process were identified from the literature and are included in Appendix B. These factors cover adoption and initiation, early and late implementation, and the set of generic outcomes expected to result from an implementation process. They guided data collection and analysis regarding the local implementation process.

Considerable emphasis and sensitivity was applied to the relationship between several state reform initiatives designed wholly, or in part, to strengthen the local improvement process. The Mentor Teacher program is a good example. The program provided the first rung of a potential career ladder, and mentor teachers were to engage in curriculum development and implementation and in staff training of both new and experienced teachers. Since the general reform goal was to improve both the curriculum program and the teaching of it, mentor teachers could be used as a new strategic resource during the implementation process, both strengthening the curriculum and helping teachers to develop skills needed to implement the new curriculum. Also, the California School Improvement Program, which provides schools with approximately $85 per child to engage in ongoing site improvement, was compatible with the need for implementing state education reform. The conceptual framework for understanding and studying education reform analyzed other state programs designed to strengthen the ongoing, local improvement process. These programs were analyzed not just in the narrow context of the rules and regulations surrounding them, but also in the broader context of their strategic use in helping local districts implement their vision of education quality.

Outcomes

Since successful education improvement produces both individual and system effects,[15] the study's conceptual framework included outcomes for the curriculum program (what is taught), for individuals within the system, that is, teachers, administrators, and students (how the curriculum is taught and the degree to which it is learned), and for the school (the social organization within which learning and teaching occurs). Cognitive skills and effective outcomes were included. These outcomes are dimensions of the three broad goals of reform described earlier in this section.

---

[15] Huberman and Miles, *Innovation Up Close.* David Crandall and Associates, *People, Policies and Programs: The Chain of School Improvement* (vol. 1-10) (Andover, MA: The Network, 1983).

Chapter 3

Methodology and Data Collection

This study was not designed to be a summative evaluation of California's education reform strategies. Instead, its purpose was to identify (1) factors associated with successful local response to education reform goals and the linkages of those factors to current education policy and (2) components of state policy that were effective (or not) in strengthening local education systems. The hope was that this information could be used to modify state policies in ways that enhance the success and widespread implementation of effective local education improvement processes.

To serve the purpose of the study, and to incorporate the study design principles described in the last chapter, the study needed to:

1. Concentrate on schools that were advanced in implementing education reform programs so that lessons learned could guide other schools.

2. Examine these schools in-depth so that the complex set of relationships between state policy initiatives, local reform agendas, implementation processes, and a variety of outcomes could be fully analyzed. These insights could then be extended by broader sample surveys and school profile reviews conducted and developed by others.

3. Carefully coordinate and monitor data collection so that extensive descriptions and cross-school comparisons of several factors could be produced.

4. Use advanced data analysis techniques so that findings could be explained and justified and could support conclusions and policy recommendations.

These needs were incorporated into the methodology. They are discussed here in terms of sample selection, data collection, and data analysis approaches.

Another part of the overall methodology was ongoing interaction between researchers and key policy actors in Sacramento. Before the study was launched, researchers briefed staff from the State Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst's office, and State Department of Education regarding the project's conceptual framework, general design, and data collection documents. After the first two rounds of data collection and analysis, researchers provided three additional briefings, one to staff from all of the above agencies, one to all education staff in the Legislative Analyst's office, and one to the deputy state superintendents. After the third round of data collection and cross-site analysis, and again just before the final report was released, researchers again provided briefings. In short, researchers made a concerted effort to maintain close connection with the policy community in Sacramento as the study was conducted, findings emerged, and policy implications were formulated.

Sample Selection

Sample schools were selected in several phases. First, nominations of schools known to be successfully implementing reforms were sought from the State Department of Education, educational organizations, local superintendents, and county offices of education. In this phase, the definition of "successful" was broad, but generally it included major curriculum change, improving the pedagogical skills of teachers or the instructional supervision skills of administrators, or creating more vibrant, collegial school organizations. Conversely, improved test scores were explicitly not used as a selection criterion in either phase of sample selection because test scores were considered an outcome variable, dependent upon the impact of independent, process and input variables.

In the second phase of the selection process, schools with evidence of substantial changes in academic course enrollments, a key goal of Senate Bill 813, were identified from among the broader set of initial candidates. To provide a set of schools that mirrored statewide demographics, the research team determined the final sample by selecting schools in large, medium, and small districts; in urban, suburban, and rural settings; and with a range of socio-economic characteristics.

In order to analyze district practices and policies that helped or hindered school reform implementation, researchers selected two schools from each of five districts, and one school from seven other districts. The second school was always a junior high school or middle school. Thus, the sample included 17 schools in 10 districts: 12 high schools and 5 junior high or middle schools.

The selection process was controlled mainly by the characteristics of the high schools, the major study focus. As a result (and unfortunately) the junior high schools as a group were not as successful as the high schools in responding to reform initiatives. While the study attempted to select high schools that were experiencing a high level of success in changing, the final sample of high schools included some sites that were experiencing a high level of success and others that were experiencing moderate to low levels of success. This mixture, however, gave the study a built-in comparative element for analyzing key factors associated with success.

Tables 1A, 1B, and 2 provide information regarding characteristics of the sample of schools. The 12 high schools, on average, were composed of 47 percent white, 9 percent black, 31 percent Hispanic, and 12 percent Asian. There was considerable variation on each of these factors. The white percentage ranged from 1 to 76, the black percentage ranged from 1 to 31, the Hispanic percentage ranged from 3 to 73, and the Asian percentage ranged from 1 to 33. Junior high and middle schools displayed similar ethnic characteristics. The 17 study schools generally reflected the cultural and ethnic diversity of California.

Schools were selected from all geographic areas of the state, including the two largest cities, rural areas in the north, the Central Valley, large urban areas, and several suburban localities, including Los Angeles and Orange counties. Thus, the schools also represented the geographic diversity of California. Schools also reflected differences in district and school size, including a large urban school with several thousand students, a rural school with less than 200 students, and schools with enrollments varying in size between these extremes.

Table 2 shows that the high schools had substantially altered student enrollment in academic classes. With 1984 serving as the base year, the schools had the following increases in enrollments: 22 percent in three or more years of mathematics, 36 percent in advanced mathematics, 31 percent in four or more years of English, 42 percent in three or more years of science, 44 percent in chemistry, and 13 percent in four or more years of history. These numbers show that the study's schools had responded vigorously to a key Senate Bill 813 goal: providing a more rigorous, academic curriculum for more students.

Although the above sample selection is typical of many recent studies of effective local policy implementation, it raises several questions because it does not rely on a random sample of schools. The thorny question is whether picking schools known to be successful with reform weakens one's ability to generalize on the basis of study results. Put differently, to what extent, given the sample, can these study findings apply to other schools? Further, should not the sample include a spectrum from successful to unsuccessful schools in order to ensure that factors associated with success are unique and not also associated with failure?

There are several good reasons for focusing the sample on schools successful with reform. First, although the sample consisted of schools experiencing success in implementing reform, schools that were selected varied across several dimensions such as metropolitan status (city, suburban, and rural), geographic location, minority enrollment, percentage of students living in poverty, and school size. Thus, the sample of schools represented a mix of factors usually associated with a more random selection process. The sample schools represented the full range of socio-economic and demographic factors characteristic of all schools in the state.

TABLE 1A: DEMOGRAPHICS - HIGH SCHOOLS (1985-86)

	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	11	12	14	15	16	18
1														
2														
3			BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS		AVERAGE
4		(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)				(ADA: 38,393 - 30,850)			(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)		(ADA: 18,341 - 182)			
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	
6														
7														
8														
9	SCHOOL POPULATION PERCENTAGES													
10	WHITE	42.6	1.9	63	40.6	86.4	55.6	10.1	20.1	78.4	88	47.7	50.3	48.89
11														
12	BLACK	24.3	31.9	4.4	18.9	2.5	0.8	3.1	1.8	1.8	3.5	8.9	0.6	8.54
13														
14	HISPANIC	7.4	51.2	6.6	34.6	4	12.7	64.9	71	14.3	4	41.6	48.6	30.09
15														
16	ASIAN/FILLIPINO	25.1	14.8	25.3	3.6	7.1.	28.6	14.3	7.1	3.1	3.5	0.8	0	11.11
17														
18	PACIFIC ISLANDER	0	0	0.3	0	0	0.8	0	0.1	0	0	0.	0	0.10
19														
20	AMERICAN INDIAN	0.7	0	0.4	15.5	0	1.3	0.8	0.2	4.5	3	0.7	0	2.28
21														
22	LIMITED ENGLISH PERCENTAGE	4.8	18.3	1.1	8.1	0	8.9	23.1	6.1	3.4	7.2	0.9	6.7	7.44
23														
24	AFDC PERCENTAGE	14	28.9	3.2	34.5	1.9	10.5	37.3	15.5	6.7		12.2	4.8	15.38
25														
26														
27														
28														
29														
30														
31														
32														
33														
34														
35														
36														
37														
38														
39														
40														
41														
42														
43														
44														
45														
46														
47														
48														
49														
50														
51														
52														
53														
54														
55														
56														
57														
58														
59														
60														
61														
62														
63														
64														
65														

TABLE 1B: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS			AVERAGE							
4		(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)				(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)										
5		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS									
6																
7																
8	DISTRICT PUPILS - TOTAL	NA	NA	115,461		31,424	NA									
9																
10	SCHOOL POPULATION PERCENTAGES															
11	WHITE			46		82	22		50							
12																
13	BLACK			10		3			6.5							
14																
15	HISPANIC			27.5		7	77		37.2							
16																
17	ASIAN/FILLIPINO	31		12		7			16.7							
18																
19	PACIFIC ISLANDER			0		0			0							
20																
21	AMERICAN INDIAN			0		0			0							
22																
23																
24	LIMITED ENGLISH PERCENTAGE	1.9		17					9.45							
25																
26	MOBILITY PERCENTAGE															
27																
28	DROP-OUT RAGE (1985-86)	4							4							
29																
30																
31																
32																
33																
34																
35																
36																
37																
38																
39																
40																
41																
42																
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48																
49																
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE 2: ENROLLMENTS IN ACADEMIC COURSES

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16	17
1																	
2																	
3			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS		
4			(ADA: 646,500-44,014)			(ADA: 36,393-30,850)					(ADA: 15,132,14,091)				(ADA: 18,341-182)		
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	AVERAGE
6																	
7	MATHEMATICS																
8	3 OR MORE YEARS																
9	1985-86	83.7	82.1	94.1		78.5	82.1	84.7	52		98.5	78.5		81.4	71.5	65.5	79
10	1983-84	77.1	59.8	77.9		65.9	76.5	82.1	50.6		68.8	66.2		61.4	53.2	45	65
11	CHANGE: 84-86	6.6	22.3	16.2		12.6	5.6	2.6	1.4		29.7	12.3		20	18.3	20.5	14
12	ADVANCED MATH																
13	1985-86	39.3	30	53		15.9	25.3	35.8	18		18	33.5		37.8	20.6	35	30
14	1983-84	24.5	28.2	26.1		34.3	8.1	29.4	12.8		13.3	29		11.6	14.8	30.2	22
15	CHANGE: 84-86	14.8	1.8	26.9		-8.4	17.2	6.4	5.2		4.7	4.5		26.2	5.8	4.8	9
16	ENGLISH																
17	4 OR MORE YEARS																
18	1985-86	94.4	78.6	98.9		96.4	99.5	73.8	92.1		96.2	86.6		73.1	75.3	100	89
19	1983-84	72.7	42.9	66.4		36.8	80.4	58.8	67.7		91.8	64.8		56.2	76.6	95	68
20	CHANGE: 84-86	21.7	35.7	32.5		59.6	19.1	15	24.4		4.4	21.8		16.9	-1.3	5	21
21	SCIENCE																
22	3 OR MORE YEARS																
23	1985-86	44.8	53.6	48.3		51	37.2	55.8	23		25.8	63.1		63.2	26.6	57.1	46
24	1983-84	38.9	29.5	32.6		48.2	26	34.4	22.2		12.1	47.7		50.3	25.8	30	33
25	CHANGE: 84-86	5.9	24.1	15.7		2.8	11.2	41.7	0.8		13.7	15.4		12.9	0.8	27.1	14
26	CHEMISTRY																
27	1985-86	49.5	54.8	41.6		40.4	43.6	12.5	27.8		24.9	33.3		24.9	49.6	60.6	39
28	1983-84	37	40.5	16.7		36.2	36.2	31.7	22.8		8.6	22.3		28	14.3	25	27
29	CHANGE: 84-86	12.5	14.3	24.9		4.2	7.4	-19.2	5		16.3	11		-3.1	35.3	35.6	12
30	PHYSICS																
31	1985-86	13.5	11.5	23.4		7.5	12.6	6.8	11.1		2.8	4.4		15.4	13.5	0	10
32	1983-84	14.2	10.8	14.9		4.6	8.7	0	8.7		0	7.7		12.1	5.7	0	7
33	CHANGE: 84-86	-0.7	0.7	8.5		2.9	3.9	6.8	2.4		2.8	-3.3		3.3	7.8	0	3
34	ADVANCED SCIENCE																
35	1985-86	47.6	...	.....		17.9	27.1	35.6	25.6		31	80.8		101.6	26.8	81.3	48
36	1983-84	.....	...	.....		.....	.....	.....	.....		....	.....		.....	.....	.....	
37	CHANGE: 84-86	.....	...	.....		.....	.....	.....	.....		...	.....		.....	.....	.....	
38	HISTORY																
39	4 OR MORE YEARS																
40	1985-86	22.4	24	32.3		88.9	29.8	30.3	78		10.2	63.9		27.1	8.9	14.8	36
41	1983-84	21.1	11.1	25.6		42.2	14.2	12.5	26.9		61.1	32.7		26.7	17	95	32
42	CHANGE: 84-86	1.3	12.9	6.7		46.7	15.6	17.8	51.1		-50.9	31.2		0.4	-8.1	-80.2	4
43	FOREIGN LANGUAGE																
44	3 OR MORE YEARS																
45	1985-86	27.8	33.8	24.2		27.8	31	18.1	15.7		18	24.9		29.2	11.8	0	22
46	1983-84	31.6	27.6	21		16.9	23.4	18.7	11.7		7.7	24.8		17	12.9	5.9	18
47	CHANGE: 84-86	-3.8	6.2	3.2		10.9	7.6	-0.6	4		10.3	0.1		12.2	-1.1	-5.9	4
48	FINE ARTS																
49	1 OR MORE YEARS																
50	1985-86	79	74.2	77		69.9	61.2	60.2	72.1		43.8	73.4		39.4	73.9	80	67
51	1983-84	69	47.2	77.5		50	59.3	65.8	58.6		40	72.2		43.6	77.6	55.6	60
52	CHANGE: 84-86	10	27	-0.5		19.9	1.9	-5.6	13.5		3.8	1.2		-4.2	-3.7	24.4	7
53																	
54																	
55																	
56																	
57																	
58																	
59																	
60																	
61																	
62																	
63																	
64																	
65																	

Second, successful schools were selected because that is the only way, given limited resources, a large enough sample can be created to analyze whether processes associated with success are common across a variety of schools. Further, consciously including "do nothing" schools in the sample would serve, at best, as a control for missing factors. That is, it is difficult to learn much from studying a school where nothing happened.

In addition, in nearly all studies that attempt to select successful schools, a number of unsuccessful or only moderately successful schools get selected anyway, as was the case in this study. Even though the study attempted to find a sample of successful schools, some variation in the sample resulted. This natural variation across the "winner" spectrum, then, allowed analysis of differences, if they existed, in the variables associated with schools moving forward with reform, schools going nowhere, and schools in the middle. It is hard to find real success stories. If the study had tried initially to select schools across the range of reform activity, the final sample would probably have been weighted toward relatively static schools. So the study started by trying to find only winners. And it ended up with mainly winners, but it also included less successful schools.

Third, the units of analysis really were the various local implementation variables, i.e., the study's conceptual framework of factors (see Appendix B). The objective was to learn about how local schools improved. The local implementation variables were based on a reading and analysis of various research literatures. The dependent and independent variables constituted the analytic focus of the study and allowed analysis of the improvement process and role of state policies in that process. Thus, the variables themselves really were the units of analysis. The hope was that, when analyzing the improvement processes across several sites, one, two, or perhaps three patterns of implementation variables would describe how the local improvement process worked. If that proved to be the case, the study could generalize across the state, since those findings would have emerged from a study of schools that varied across key socio-economic and demographic dimensions. The study then could conclude that, if other schools reproduced the causal sequencing of variables the study found associated with successful local system improvement, then those schools also ought to experience similar improvement.

Data Collection

Data collection was conducted during the 1986-87 academic year in three related rounds of fieldwork and case write-up. The fall round of data collection and case reporting focused on state policy initiatives and local reform visions. The winter round focused on the local implementation process, including the role of state programs in this process and on the special student populations dimension of the study. Finally, the spring round focused on outcomes for students, teachers, administrators, and schools as organizations.

A team of one or two data collectors visited each site (district and school) to interview, observe, and examine materials. The team then prepared case materials that focused on specific reform features as well as professional and program interactions at each site. Data collection was conducted by a team of University of Southern California, University of California at Berkeley, and Stanford University researchers.

Producing high-quality, coordinated case material for 17 secondary schools required considerable management of the data collection effort. Critical elements of data collection included:

1. Focused, well-designed data collection instruments (described below)

2. Multiple rounds of data collection, each with a specific focus and the ability to return to each site to collect additional data as needed

3. Extensive training of data collectors that included the study's conceptual framework, data collection techniques, procedures for case study write-ups, and logistical arrangements

4. Careful monitoring of the quality and compatibility of each case study and coordination of case write-ups

Data collection procedures related to these elements are discussed below.

To develop a common conceptual framework for understanding the study objectives and the intellectual substance driving the study, a long briefing document was prepared that reviewed the relevant literatures and detailed the intellectual assumptions of the study. The substance of this literature review is summarized in this report in chapter 2. An October staff training meeting and January analytic meeting devoted considerable time to analysis and discussion of this conceptual material.

The study team conducted research at the district and school levels, although most of the research occurred in the schools. The following schedule indicates the average number of days of fieldwork for each school:

Round 1	District Fieldwork	2 days
	School Fieldwork	3 days
Round II	District Fieldwork	1 day
	School Fieldwork	2 days
Round III	District Fieldwork	1 day
	School Fieldwork	2 days
Total Fieldwork days (excluding state)		11 days

Approximately 11 days of fieldwork were allotted to each school in the study. In all, the study provided nearly 200 days of intensive fieldwork on the impact of Senate Bill 813 in 17 California schools. Research was conducted over the course of a school year, allowing analysis of how implementation evolved during an academic year, and, through reconstruction, analysis of the implementation process as it had developed in preceding years. For each round of data collection, vast amounts of qualitative and quantitative data were gathered that described how particular reform provisions "looked" in schools and whether schools had become more effective as a result of reform.

State Program Implementation and Local Reform Vision

In Round 1, each site researcher produced qualitative data that answered, for each of 14 state policies, a series of detailed questions about the policy as implemented in the school, the process of implementation, linkage to school and district vision and other state policies, and perceptions of the policy's purpose and substance by teachers and administrators. Field reports averaged 50 pages. In addition, each site researcher prepared a case study of the school's overall response to reform, integrating individual state policies with state and school visions. Appendix A contains the research instruments used to collect these data.

The Local Implementation Process

In Round 2, each site researcher produced another large report which answered detailed questions about the 26 implementation variables in the conceptual framework, variables shown by other research to be important in successful education program implementation. These variables were arrayed through the stages of implementation, so the data describe the factors not only individually but also in the context of their place in an implementation process. In addition, another case study described the site's overall implementation themes and discussed how the factors interrelated to produce successful (or unsuccessful) implementation. Appendix B contains the research instruments used to collect these data.

Outcomes

In Round 3, outcome data were collected for students, teachers and administrators, curricular changes, and schools as social organizations. On a scale of 0 to 100, researchers determined each school's ranking for the variables listed below for 1982, the year before reform, and for 1987, four years after reform. The difference indicated the amount of change for each variable. On a scale from 0 to 6, researchers indicated the degree to which Senate Bill 813 contributed to the change, with a 3 indicating no Senate Bill 813 impact, a score below 3 indicating a negative impact, and a score above 3 indicating a positive impact. For students, researchers ranked:

- their treatment in schools
- achievement on nationally normed, standardized achievement tests
- dropout rates
- achievement on local proficiency tests
- low grades in new academic courses, mathematics, science, and English

For teachers, researchers ranked:

- the extent of their subject-matter content knowledge
- their traditional instructional skills, including clinical teaching (the basic pedagogical skill for traditional high school courses)
- their instructional skills for teaching higher order thinking skills (the emphasis of the new curriculum)
- their sense of efficacy.

For administrators, researchers ranked:

- district administrators' ability to develop an education vision
- site administrators' ability to develop an education vision
- site administrators' ability to manage a complex education change process
- site administrators' ability to manage revised curriculum and instructional programs, which the study termed Phase 1 and Phase 2 types of reform
- site administrators' clinical supervision skills
- site administrators' ability to manage curricular change focused on higher-order thinking skills, which the study termed Phase 3 and Phase 4 types of reform

For school climate, researchers ranked:

- to what degree teachers and administrators shared a school vision
- collegiality and mutual trust among and between teachers and administrators
- the amount of teacher discussion about teaching and learning
- norm of "continuous improvement"

Appendix C contains the research instruments used to collect these data.

Programs for Special Populations

Finally, an additional series of data described the operation of four special-needs student programs—remedial, compensatory, limited-English-proficient, and at-risk of dropping out—and how these programs were or were not integrated with the overall improvement initiatives. Appendix D contains the research instruments used to collect these data.

Other quantitative, California Assessment Program (CAP) test score, descriptive, and socio-demographic data were also collected from schools and districts. The final data base is large, rich, diverse, and unique.

Data Analysis

Data analysis in the study was guided by two major principles:

1. To ensure that the data to be analyzed were of sufficient quality, were comparable across sites, and were accessible to readers

2. To provide a grounded, accountable means of identifying findings and supporting policy recommendations from the study

Strategies to ensure that the data analyzed were of sufficient quality and were comparable across sites were incorporated in the study design and data collection and included:

1. Applying a conceptual framework of implementation variables to data collection and case write-ups

2. Obtaining data from sites through specific, highly-directive questions on focused topics in combination with more global, less-directive questions that allowed the unique relationships within a given site to be reported. The write-up of the information at both specific topic and global levels helped communicate individual site information more effectively to cross-site analysts.

3. Using multiple rounds of data collection so that training and data collection could be focused more specifically within a round and so that missing information could be obtained in subsequent rounds.

4. Providing data collectors with extensive training that included procedures and formats for preparing reports.

Other strategies were used to follow-up data collection in order to enhance the quality and comparability of information across sites. These strategies included:

1. Model write-ups of the information obtained at a site so that other data collectors could see the level of detail and organization desired by the study's chief analysts.

2. Feedback to individual data collectors about their write-ups and identification of needed supplemental information. Similarly, areas were identified where more information was needed from all data collectors in the next round of research.

3. Post-data collection analytic meetings where data collectors pooled insights and refined their descriptions of local sites. All data collectors met for two-day analytic meetings, in January after the first round of data collection and in June after all data had been collected. An additional meeting of the study directors was held in April. In several instances, all data collectors were asked to provide additional information about a specific topic, or to generate high-inference ratings for newly defined variables.

Data analysis was pursued in two primary ways: (1) identifying tentative themes in analytic meetings which then were confirmed in subsequent analysis of case studies and (2) conducting inductive analysis of the case studies themselves. Themes identified in group meetings were explored by (1) memos written by the core team to capture and extend the ideas generated in the meetings, and (2) memos written by individual data collectors about their specific sites in relation to the ideas developed in the analytic meetings.

The inductive analysis of case survey material took place in several phases. For each site, case study material consisted of (1) descriptions of each state policy as implemented in each site and district, (2) a global report focusing on district and school visions and initial implementation of locally defined reform, (3) a discussion of local implementation variables and approaches alone and in combination, (4) a description of local programs serving four types of special populations and the relationship of these programs to the reform effort, and (5) outcome ratings regarding school climate, administrative practice, teacher practice, and student accomplishment. Because the case study material was well organized and labeled, no within-site analysis was needed prior to commencing the cross-site analysis.

In the first phase of the cross-site analysis, extensive low-inference descriptive information was assembled using the same descriptors for each site. Site information was displayed in columns ordered by size of district. Steps used to prepare these charts included generating the descriptors, summarizing the information for each site using these descriptors, and confirming this analysis, first by a second analyst, then by the site researcher. The second phase of the cross-site analysis consisted of reducing the descriptive information to inference ratings (such as high, moderate, and low). A high inference rating was prepared for each of the implementation factors identified in the conceptual framework.

The final phase of the cross-site analysis began by clustering sites according to their ratings or performance on selected outcomes. For example, schools were clustered according to their gains in reading and math achievement as assessed by their CAP score differences between 1983 and 1987. Next, the high-inference ratings of the implementation process (from the second phase of the analysis) were displayed for each school in each cluster. Finally, the charts were analyzed to identify implementation antecedents related to (1) CAP gains (b) organizational capacity gains (the combination of school climate and administrative capacity), and (3) extensive implementation of Phase 3 reforms.

The entire set of displays for the first, second, and final phases of the analysis appear in the appendices. The final-phase charts display the implementation antecedents of several outcomes-based clustering of sites. These charts are labeled as the "stories" of these outcomes. The second-phase chart (high inference ratings for each implementation factor) and the supporting first-phase charts (low inference descriptive information about each implementation factor) appear as the Causal Factor charts in the appendices.

Chapter 4

Major Findings

The major study findings are listed below and each is subsequently described in greater detail.

Finding #1: Virtually all schools studied implemented key Senate Bill 813 education provisions in a manner consistent with state purposes.

- In all of the sample districts, SB 813's increased high school graduation requirements were implemented. In many locations, this was already underway at the time SB 813 was enacted.

- Senate Bill 813's required model curriculum standards have been included in district guidelines at two-thirds of the high schools in the study sample and incorporated into actual subjects in half the schools.

- The combination of additional funds provided by SB 813 and new curriculum standards resulted in the selection and purchase of new, more rigorous texts in a majority of sample schools.

- The California Assessment Program (CAP) is receiving greater attention and use in most of the sample schools. It is used to assess educational progress, to pinpoint problem areas, and to modify curricula.

- All sample schools implemented the longer school day and year–this having been started in many districts before the passage of SB 813.

- All sample schools implemented the 10th grade counseling program.

Finding #2: Senate Bill 813 reform provisions can be effective when woven into a cohesive school change strategy at the local level.

- The study's sample schools show that local education leaders can weave the fragmented components of SB 813 and related state initiatives into a cohesive program of local school change that, when implemented effectively, can improve schools.

- In many sample districts, both commitment to major reform and many concrete efforts to bring it about were underway through local initiation before SB 813. However, research teams concluded that SB 813's legislative force and fiscal resources were crucially important, and without them, many local reform efforts might have foundered.

- In sample schools and districts, SB 813 raised teachers' and administrators' commitment and efforts to improve the quality of education. In these schools generally, SB 813's combination of rigorous new standards and added resources produced a renewed determination to upgrade education.
- Most sample districts and schools placed renewed emphasis on curriculum and instruction issues, education's core activities.
- Districts tended to centralize curriculum and instruction improvement and to move beyond formal state curriculum program implementation into broader curriculum upgrading.
- Districts developed districtwide K-12 curriculum scopes and sequences that aligned curriculum objectives with new textbooks, state model curiculum standards, local tests, and state CAP tests.
- New academic courses represented substantive academic rigor and not relabeled or watered-down versions of old courses.
- Many schools developed new emphases in reading and writing across curriculum content areas, and required more mathematics and science for the average student.
- Most schools implemented programs designed to improve student CAP test scores.
- Most districts implemented staff development programs to strengthen teachers' instructional strategies.
- Sample districts did not view SB 813 as onerous or requiring unreasonable paperwork.

Finding #3: Successful local reform implementation exhibits several key themes.

- District leadership was important both in initiating local reform action and in supporting, over several years, full reform implementation.
- District leaders transformed disparate SB 813 elements into integrated district reform visions that retained the state's academic and intellectually demanding orientation and tailored them appropriately to local priorities.

- Schools added to this district vision a school focus on an improved learning environment, including heightened concern for all students and teacher collegiality.

- Teacher and site administrator participation in designing specific implementation activities balanced top-down district and state reform implementation. School and district "teaming" in ongoing reform implementation helped integrate school and district visions and activities.

- Staff development combined with follow-up assistance in schools and classrooms produced the most improvements in teachers' and administrators' professional expertise.

Finding #4: Attention to both the substance of curriculum and instruction and the process of school change are associated with higher test scores and better learning conditions for students.

- Student CAP scores in the sample schools increased more than the statewide average. Further, CAP scores rose for all students, those at the bottom, those in the middle, and those at the top.

- Senate Bill 813 changes in particular and the broader reform effort in general had more influence on sample high schools than sample middle schools probably because SB 813's provisions are directed more specifically at the high school.

- Students in the sample schools are now subject to more rigorous and academically oriented educational expectations.

- Administrative expertise and practice in the sample schools improved. Administrators were more able to design and implement a strengthened program of instruction, manage a reform process, and supervise instruction.

- Teachers' sense of professional efficacy increased.

- Sample schools improved as institutions. They had clearer plans and stronger norms of teacher collegiality.

Finding #5: Students with special learning needs–the poor, remedial, limited-English-speaking, and at risk of dropping out–received increased services, but the services were of a type that produced insufficient levels of academic achievement in the past. Sample schools lacked sufficient strategies for mounting more effective interventions for at-risk students.

Finding #6: Sample schools desired to engage in more complex school improvement, including a curriculum focused on problem solving and higher order skills, but were searching for more effective strategies and assistance to do so.

State agencies also played a major role in improving these schools, but with the caveat that state initiatives interacted with local efforts that often were launched prior to SB 813. "SB 813 didn't cause the reform, " said one local superintendent, "but it sure helped." In the view of many local respondents, the state (1) increased the momentum and continuity of local reform; (2) provided critical technical assistance to districts and schools; (3) monitored and reinforced successful performance; and (4) provided useful direction and materials such as increased high school graduation requirements, new CAP tests, the mentor teacher program, model curriculum standards, and the new state curriculum frameworks.

Implementation of SB 813 Policies and Programs

The study examined the local implementation of several key SB 813 policies and additional state initiatives. This section summarizes and synthesizes study findings about how the following policies and programs fitted together and operated in local districts:

- increased high school graduation requirements
- model curriculum standards
- textbook selection criteria
- new state CAP tests, especially the 8th grade CAP
- mentor teacher program
- certification for teacher evaluators
- additional staff development for teachers and administrators
- 10th grade counseling program
- California's school improvement program
- homework policy
- longer days and years
- quality indicators

Increased High School Graduation, CSU, and UC Entrance Requirements

Effective in the 1986-87 school year, SB 813 mandated new statewide requirements for graduation from high school. The State Board of Education developed even more rigorous standards, though they only bore the weight of recommendations, not mandates. These entrance requirements are given below. Numbers refer to years.

	SB 813 Requirements	State Board Recommendations	CSU Required 1988	UC Required 1988
English	3	4	4	4
Math	2	3	3	3
Algebra	-	(1)		
Geometry	-	(1)		
Science	2	2	1	1
Physical	(1)	(1)		
Life	(1)	(1)		
Social Studies	3	3	(this may be taken as one year of U.S. History or .5 year U.S. History and .5 year Civics or American Govt.)	
World Civ.	(1)	(1)		
U.S. Hist.	(1)	(1)		
Ethics	-	(.5)		
Am. Gov.	(1)	-		
Economics	-	(.5)		
Foreign Lang.	1 (or Fine Arts)	2 (in same language)	2	2
Fine Arts				
Computer Studies	-	(.5)		
Physical Ed.	2			
Electives			3	4

Note: Subsequent legislation has mandated 0.5 year of economics for high school graduation.

Study Findings–Graduation Requirements

- All sample districts increased high school graduation requirements to the SB 813 minimums.
- Most sample districts increased high school graduation requirements in anticipation of the SB 813 mandates. The effective dates of increased requirements often fell immediately prior to SB 813 timelines.
- English and mathematics requirements in sample districts generally fall above SB 813 mandates, but slightly below state board recommendations.

Model Curriculum Standards

To assist local school districts in upgrading course content, SB 813 required the State Department of Education to develop model curriculum standards for the mandated graduated requirements. School districts were required to compare their local curriculum to the model standards at least once every three years. The model curriculum standards were intended to serve as a model, not a mandate. The standards have been designed to allow boards as much flexibility as possible in making comparisons, and in implementing strategies and details. The content that should be covered by the time students have completed, for example, three years of English, is clear in general terms but can be accomplished in a variety of ways. Model curriculum standards have been developed for grades 9-12 in the following subject matter areas:

- English and Language Arts
- Foreign Language
- History and Social Science
- Mathematics
- Science
- Visual and Performing Arts

Study Findings–Model Curriculum Standards

- Model curriculum standards were compared, as required by SB 813, to district curriculum guides in 11 of 12 high schools and four of five junior schools.
- The content of model curriculum standards in most subjects has been included in *district* guidelines at eight out of 12 sample high schools.
- When incorporated in the curriculum guides, model curriculum standards have resulted in a stronger emphasis on higher order thinking skills,writing, and reading across content areas.
- The impact of model curriculum standards on changes in course content in the classroom has been low.
- Only six of 12 sample high schools claimed to have incorporated model curriculum standards into the subjects as actually taught in the school.
- Model curriculum standards have had minor impacts on curriculum change at the junior high or middle school levels.
- Teachers frequently stated that model curriculum standards are difficult to implement; they include too many topical subjects and are difficult for some groups of students.
- Model curriculum standards appear to be an effective beginning step to major curriculum reform. Model curriculum standards are stimulating districts to strengthen and deepen curricula and accelerate the pace of instruction. The new standards are operating at the district level. Such is not always the case for the new curriculum in classrooms.

Changes in Textbooks Adopted

California high schools, grades 9-12, adopt textbooks based on their own district policies. Textbook selection for a given subject occurs every six years. During the year of the study, texts were being selected for science, social studies, English as a Second Language (ESL), English, and economics.

Junior and middle schools must select texts from a state adopted list when purchasing them with state textbook funds. Recently, the state began to require publishers to cover content in greater substantive depth, to include higher level skills as well as basic content and knowledge skills, and to cover in an objective manner some controversial topics.

Study Findings–Text Selection

- Almost all sample schools select texts by using teams of teachers, administrators, and central office personnel. Once these teams develop a list of texts, individual teachers frequently suggest which books from this list should be purchased.
- Alignment of texts with district curriculum and tests is effective at both the junior and senior high school levels in the study sample.
- Nine of 12 sample high schools and all junior highs write curriculum before selecting texts. One high school selects texts prior to writing curriculum.
- Sample districts are aware of the need to upgrade texts, so there have been changes regarding better texts, more difficult texts, and the inclusion of higher order thinking skills.
- Texts, along with model curriculum standards and tests, are a key link to curriculum changes.
- Teachers in sample schools are using new texts in their courses.

CAP and Other New Tests

Statewide testing of all California 3rd, 6th, and 12th graders has been conducted since 1973. The California Assessment Program (CAP) provides achievement information on school and district levels, not for individual students. This testing program uses questions specifically designed to match California's school curriculum. The 8th grade test includes reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies. Currently, only reading, mathematics, and written language are assessed in the 3rd, 6th, and 12th grade tests. Future tests for these grades also will include writing samples, as well as science, history-social science, and critical thinking across all content areas. The current 12th grade reading and mathematics tests have recently been revised, are now more aligned with model curriculum guides, and will be administered in December 1987.

Study Findings–Tests

- CAP reading scores rose in all sample high schools and in four out of five sample junior high schools; CAP mathematics scores rose in 10 of 12 high schools and in four out of five junior high schools. Average CAP score gains in both reading and mathematics rose above statewide average increases for both the high schools and the junior high schools.
- Statewide testing strongly influenced curriculum change in sample schools.
- All sample schools were sensitive to the importance of CAP tests to school and district public image.
- CAP drove sample school curriculum changes by emphasizing higher order thinking skills, writing, and science.
- Most sample junior and senior high school personnel were aware of the new 8th grade CAP, with its emphasis on problem-solving application and higher-level thinking skills. Most were also aware of the new 8th grade direct writing assessment. Most high school personnel were aware that the 12th grade CAP will change drastically in December 1987 when the new version will be given.
- Eight of 12 sample high schools and all five junior high schools specified that the CAP had a high or medium influence on their school "vision."
- Some degree of testing review is conducted for students at eight of 12 sample high schools and two junior highs. Schools are becoming more sophisticated about tests. Students are being taught how to take tests, tests are being integrated into the curriculum, specific test content review often is provided, and schools are striving to increase students' test scores.

Mentor Teacher Program

The California Mentor Teacher Program provides state-funded stipends for up to five percent of classroom teachers in California. In order to qualify for a stipend, a candidate must be a credentialed, permanent classroom teacher, have recent teaching experience, and have demonstrated exemplary teaching ability.

A selection committee, composed of a majority of classroom teachers, nominates candidates for mentor positions. Candidates are selected by the school board from those nominated. Mentors receive a $4,000 stipend above their regular salary for performing any of the following duties, as determined by the district:

- Provide assistance and guidance to new teachers (a mentor's primary function)
- Provide assistance and guidance to more experienced teachers
- Provide curriculum development

The only restrictions placed on mentors are that they must spend at least 60 percent of their time "in direct instruction of students" and they may not formally evaluate other teachers.

Districts are provided funds for other support costs associated with the program. In the 1983-84 and 1984-85 school years, districts received $2,000 per mentor to cover these costs.

Study Findings–Mentor Teacher Program

- Mentor selection processes varied in sample districts and schools but generally included application, interview, and observation.
- Mentor programs were affected by labor issues, and the necessity to bargain terms and conditions delayed or altered implementation in some sample schools.
- "Mentor" designations at times influenced teacher collaboration negatively rather than extending peer interaction.
- Mentors were used primarily for curriculum development and secondarily to provide assistance to both new and experienced teachers.
- Assistance provided to teachers was on a voluntary basis.
- Generally, mentor deployment had not been heavily coordinated with local school reform or change efforts promoted by the state.
- Administrative support and direction at both sample districts and schools appears to be a factor in mentor success and use. Although districts provided little training and assistance to their mentors, when it was provided, it was generally in the area of clinical teaching and helped improve mentor activities.
- Reliance upon mentors by staff was low, in part due to lack of clarity regarding roles. Administrative knowledge and support of mentors seemed to increase visibility and usage.
- The $2,000 per mentor administrative stipend was frequently employed to provide release time for mentors, money for mentors to attend conferences and workshops, and to purchase materials and supplies.

Certification of Teacher Evaluators and New Teacher Evaluation Systems

SB 813 required teacher evaluators to be certified in a set of newly identified competencies. In order for school districts to receive school apportionments from the State School Fund, on or before 12/1/84, they had to adopt regulations establishing the certification of personnel assigned to evaluate teachers. Teacher evaluators needed to demonstrate competence in instructional methodologies and evaluation for the teachers they were assigned to evaluate. Personnel were to be competent in the following areas:

- Instructional leadership–the ability of an administrator to provide educational as well as managerial direction
- Curriculum knowledge of the content, structure, scope, and sequence of what students are being taught
- Instruction–knowledge of how students are taught, including multiple teaching methodologies to reflect multiple learning styles
- Assessment–what students are learning, the ability to use data to establish performance standards and make program decisions
- School climate–the ability to create and sustain supportive and appropriate learning environments for students and school staffs
- Staff development–knowledge of and commitment to assessing and providing staff development tied to district curriculum, instructional priorities, and teacher needs
- Supervision–knowledge of and ability to supervise teachers through observation conferencing, and staff development, as well as professional responsibilities to evaluate teaching performance
- Evaluation and documentation–ability to use state laws, district policies, contract provisions and appropriate supervision techniques to recognize superior performance and to correct poor performance.

In addition, administrators needed to know district procedures for diagnosing student needs, how the instructional program met those needs, and how assessment data were used to support revisions in instruction. An effective teacher evaluation system is built upon local needs and services, and the administrator should have a strong ability to motivate staff and supervise instruction, as well as evaluate teaching performance.

Study Findings–Certification for Teacher Evaluators

- Fifteen of the 17 sample schools trained all administrators in teacher evaluation. One indicated that new principals were trained as they came on board, implying that all were trained.
- Ten of the 17 schools offered medium-intensity training, which might include an initial training session with an annual review. Two schools had low-intensity, "one shot" training. The four instances of high-intensity training offered follow-up and, in some cases, observation and peer coaching of the evaluation process.
- In five cases, training was provided by the district alone; one was provided by outside consultants alone, and 10 were provided by a combination of district resources and outside consultants. There appeared to be no relationship between the intensity and delivery system of the training.
- Fourteen sample schools specified the use of a clinical supervision model.
- Eight of the 17 schools reported some type of follow-up activity for the training. Nine did not mention follow-up.
- Fourteen of the schools indicated that the principals were supervising in the manner in which they were trained; three were not.
- Five senior high schools and five junior high schools indicated that their method of teacher evaluation was not new since SB 813. Most of these schools stated they had been satisfied with the quality of their teacher evaluations for some time.
- Seven schools indicated that the districts had done the training and that was all. Three reported that the reform was a major impetus for launching an administrative training program. Seven stated that reform had had no impact in that they had a good evaluation system for some time.

Other Local Staff Development for Teachers and Administrators

The study also gathered information on other local staff development activities. Senate Bill 813 mandated that teachers hired after September 1985 receive 150 hours of staff development every five years.

Study Findings–Staff Development for Teachers

- There is a widespread base of training in clinical teaching and clinical supervision on which future staff development activities can build. Staff development focused on improving instruction, and administrator supervision of instruction has become standard procedure in many sample schools. This base of staff development could be "exploited" as more content and grade-specific staff development focuses on implementing the model curriculum standards, the new state frameworks, and CAP tests.
- Staff development generally took the form of formal inservice training.
- The most common themes in sample schools for staff development were clinical teaching, curriculum content, general pedagogy, and classroom management.
- Participation in staff development activities that promoted district-wide pedagogical and clinical teaching activities was most often mandatory. Participation in additional staff development activities was often voluntary.
- When they existed, mentors were frequently used as part of the district's staff development program.
- There was greater use of district or local trainers as compared with reliance on outside consultants.
- County offices appeared to be only infrequently utilized as a resource.
- Follow-up coaching was limited.
- The extent to which new instruction techniques explained in staff development are actually used in the classroom is unclear.

Study Findings–Staff Development for Administrators

- All principals and most administrators received some type of staff training.
- Of the 17 sample sites, five had mandatory training, eight had a combination of mandatory and voluntary training provided. Seven sites used a combination of district and outside consultants for training.
- Fourteen sites indicated that training was done by the district; at four sites this was the only training provided. Seven sites used a combination of district and outside consultants for training.
- Nine sample sites were using administrative training centers as part of their training program. Three sites were using county resources.
- At the junior highs, the method of training was equally provided through meetings, conferences, and inservice training sessions. At the high schools, all three methods were also used, but meetings, both formal and informal, were relied upon more heavily.
- The intensity of administrative staff development was analyzed by researchers as follows: seven showed low intensity, five medium, and four high. The other sites did not provide sufficient information to gauge the intensity of the training.
- Six sites indicated that follow-up coaching was provided to administrators.
- Sixteen of the 17 sample sites indicated that clinical supervision was at least one, often the only, purpose of administrative training. This policy is linked tightly to teacher evaluations. Ten provided training in curriculum and instruction. Other popular topics were effective schools, district reform goals, and leadership.

School Improvement Program

California's School Improvement Program provides approximately $85 per student to schools in the program to develop and implement a school site-defined education improvement program. A School Improvement Program Quality Review is conducted every three years to evaluate each school's program. Until recently, the review was conducted by State Department of Education monitors, and it emphasized program services for special-needs students. In 1983-84, the program quality review guides were changed and the program quality review function was decentralized to the local level. Now, program quality review focuses on the quality of a school curriculum program and the degree to which categorical services for special student populations reinforce the core, curriculum program. These changes specify in more detail the substance of local School Improvement programs and signal that School Improvement can be used as a program for implementing curriculum change in response to education reform mandates. Further, consortia of *local* educators now conduct program quality reviews, thus removing the state from the local review process.

Study Findings–School Improvement Program

- A majority of schools in this study did not receive School Improvement funds.
- Three sample high schools participating in the School Improvement program indicated a high influence of the program on reform.
- School participating in the School Improvement Program had a process for engaging in efforts to improve the school and knew how to develop a long-term plan, and SB 813 gave them a more focused direction.
- The two schools using Achievement Council assistance reported a high impact on the school's reform efforts, in general ways similar to a school improvement program.
- The focus of School Improvement at the high schools was generally on staff development, computers, and raising the quality of education for minority populations.
- The focus of School Improvement at the junior high schools was on staff development and raising test scores.

Homework Policies

SB 813 required each district to develop a homework policy.

Study Findings–Homework Policy

- Seven districts had developed a homework policy. In addition, three high schools and two junior highs also had individual site policies.
- There has been little or no effect in sample schools of the homework policy related to school reform efforts.
- It appears difficult for districts or sites to enforce homework policies.
- Homework practices seem to be a classroom teacher responsibility, difficult to affect by district policy.
- There was a general sense that the amount of homework being assigned by teachers had increased in the past four years, but more as a result of a new national atmosphere of "academic orientation" and not because of new district homework policies.

Tenth Grade Counseling

SB 813 provided a program for districts to establish a comprehensive program of counseling for pupils reaching the age of 16, or for pupils prior to the end of the 10th grade, whichever occurs first. The counseling program must review a pupil's academic progress and educational options and design an academic program that would lead to high school graduation. Districts were eligible to receive $20 per 10th grade pupil for counseling services provided in 1983-84 and in 1984-85 for services which supplemented, but did not supplant, existing services.

Study Findings–Tenth Grade Counseling

- A 10th grade counseling program was implemented in all 12 sample high schools.
- The focus of counseling is college preparation, dropout prevention, and high school course planning to ensure graduation.
- Parents are involved in the counseling provided at most of the sample high schools.
- Counselor-student ratios varied from 1:71 to 1:440.
- Four sample schools extended the program to the 9th grade, and one received permission to implement the program in 8th grade.
- No pattern was found in the manner in which the counseling money was used.
- Students are generally counseled once a year; one school was providing counseling twice a year.
- This policy was fully implemented in all sample schools; however, the quality of the program is mixed.

Longer School Day and Longer School Year Incentives

In 1984-85, districts operating school for at least 180 days were entitled to an additional $35 per unit of average daily attendance (ADA), exclusive of adult ADA and summer school ADA. Thereafter, districts needed to maintain the 180 day instructional year in order to retain the financial bonus.

Based upon the number of instructional minutes offered in 1982-83 and instructional minutes offered in 1983-84, districts received a bonus of $20 per ADA in grades K-8 and $40 per ADA in grades 9-12 for each of three years if they increased the number of instructional minutes one third of the distance per year toward, or met and maintained, the following goals:

- 36,000 annual minutes in Kindergarten
- 50,000 annual minutes in grades 1-3, inclusive
- 54,400 annual minutes in grades 4-8, inclusive
- 64,800 annual minutes in grades 9-12, inclusive

Schools had several options for increasing the school day or year. Some examples include:

- adding a homeroom where none previously existed
- increasing the passing time between class periods
- increasing the minutes of each period
- increasing the number of school days in the year.

Study Findings–Longer School Day and Longer School Year

- Several sample schools had begun the process of lengthening the day prior to SB 813.
- Where there were previous cutbacks in the day and year, the lengthening resulted in major effects at the school level.
- The biggest change seems to be the addition of a 6th period and more days in a year.
- Some sample schools increased the day beyond the minimum required. the cases in which entire additional periods were added.
- The impact of the longer day and year on school reform was at best modest, except for the cases in which entire additional class periods were added.
- Most schools stressed the advantage of the extra money they received by complying with the minimum school day and year requirements.

Quality Indicators

The first phase of the state's "quality indicators" accountability program was to identify the measures against which educational progress will be judged and to establish goals for statewide improvement. A comprehensive set of accountability measures was developed which include the following *state quality indicators*:

- increased enrollment in mathematics, English, science, history and social studies, foreign language, and fine arts
- improved statewide CAP test scores
- reduced dropout rates and increased student attendance rates
- increased performance of the college-bound student on the SAT and AP exams and College Board achievement tests

Statewide targets for improvement through 1990 were established for each quality indicator. The accountability program also asked districts and schools to establish their own local targets and improvement strategies to help meet the state goals. Such *local quality indicators* could draw on a larger body of evidence and address:

- strength of the school's curriculum, describing what is being taught and how well students are learning what they are being taught
- amount and quality of writing assignments completed by students
- amount and quality of homework assignments completed by students
- number and types of books read by students
- support the school receives from the community and parents
- awards and recognition received by the school, its teachers, and students
- nature and quality of support the school provides students with special needs
- participation by students in extracurricular activities

Study Findings–Quality Indicators

- Eight sample high schools and four junior highs had developed *local quality indicators*. Of these schools, the influence of these indicators on reform varied: high (4), medium (4), low (3), none (1).
- The impact of the *state's quality indicators* on school reform varied: high (3), medium (6), low (4), none (4). There was a substantive impact in all but one high school and in all but one junior high school, including increased attention to test scores, AP courses, and dropouts.

Implementation Phases

Districts in the study tended to initiate and implement educational reform in a series of phases. The first phase was the immediate concern of the SB 813 legislation–more rigorous high school graduation requirements and a longer school day and year. The second phase can be characterized as re-establishing an "academic orientation" in secondary schools and included upgraded curriculum standards, new and better textbooks, new and more difficult tests, mentor teachers, more administrator supervision of instruction, and expanded school accountability through the use of so-called "quality indicators." The more recent third phase focuses on revised curriculum and instruction that emphasizes thinking and problem-solving skills, inquiry-oriented history and geography, more mathematics and science, and integration of writing assignments across content areas. This third phase has been incorporated into California's new 8th grade CAP test and several recent state curriculum frameworks; it will be included in the state's revised 12th and 6th grade CAP tests.

For the first two reform phases, the major SB 813 policies and programs were at an advanced stage of implementation in nearly all schools studied. Sample districts increased high school graduation requirements and upgraded curriculum standards. While schools in the study were selected because they had increased student enrollments in academic courses, the study confirmed that these courses were not "watered down" or relabeled versions of old courses. Instead, they represented legitimate academic content–a substantively more demanding curriculum. Districts also lengthened the school day and year, purchased new and better textbooks, administered new and more difficult state tests, created a cadre of mentor teachers, raised teacher salaries, and expanded accountability by developing Quality Indicators, all during the past four years. These actions constituted the core of the education reform in California.

Improving the Curriculum and Enhancing Instruction

The state, through SB 813 model curriculum standards, state curriculum frameworks, and CAP tests, helped sample districts clarify and coordinate curriculum elements such as goals, texts and other instructional materials, instructional strategies, and tests of student progress. This is often called "curriculum alignment," and the elements constitute the technical core of a school's curriculum and instruction program.

Sample schools and districts did more than simply implement SB 813 curriculum initiatives. They used them as a springboard to engage in comprehensive curriculum upgrading. New district K-12 curriculum "scopes and sequences" were created, new academic courses were developed particularly in mathematics and science for the average student, new cross-content emphases were begun such as reading and writing across the curriculum and new interest emerged for thinking and problem solving skills.

One of the most powerful state influences on the technical core of sample schools was the CAP testing program. State CAP tests were driving local curriculum change. While the older versions of CAP produced a curriculum focused on basic skills, the new CAP tests, especially at the 8th grade level, are promoting a curriculum with more subjects and greater attention to problem solving and other higher level thinking skills. Moreover, there were many positive examples of how the CAP test was helping districts and sites make curriculum improvements and stimulate reconsideration of local curriculum in light of the focus of the state tests, especially the new 8th grade CAP.

The study found that the sample school systems were actively involved in a wide array of staff development activities, some spawned by SB 813 and others locally initiated. Workshops of short duration with limited or nonexistent follow-up coaching typified most staff development. Moreover, staff development often had an inconsistent relationship to the overall reform direction, although many districts had plans to strengthen this role for staff development. The study also found considerable local awareness in sample districts about generic (i.e., clinical teaching) versus content-specific teaching strategies, and the districts' disposition now was to build upon the generic base and move into more content-specific training in order to help implement the goals of the new state curriculum frameworks.

While mentor teacher programs were formally operational in most sample districts, many were only loosely linked to the overall school reform efforts and usually provided services to volunteers, few of whom were experienced teachers. Many sample districts, however, had plans to shift mentor roles towards greater integration with overall reform implementation, and mentors appeared to welcome this change.

Critical Factors for Improving Schools: The Local Implementation Process

Successful local education reform implementation had several important themes in sample districts. First, district leaders transformed the state technical core of curriculum and instructional elements into integrated, district visions of reform. District leaders used the state curriculum and instructional elements because they believed that these represented important and substantively sound content. They also assumed ownership of the reform process because they had themselves initiated similar, though limited, actions before SB 813. Further, district leaders tailored the state reform to local needs and priorities without destroying its essence. The content of the resulting local vision was a more integrated, substantively rigorous, technical core of curriculum and instruction than districts had prior to 1983, and included a greater academic orientation than previously had been the case. District leadership, in other words, was important. District leaders established the reform vision for the sample districts.

The second theme is that the new district academically oriented and intellectually demanding curriculum was balanced at the site by a complementary school vision that often emphasized an intense concern for students' self-esteem, teacher collegiality, and overall social responsibility. The school vision often matched the demographic characteristics of local school environments and made the more academically demanding district program possible to implement. This finding fits with the strong role of school climate displayed in other effective secondary school research.

The third theme is that the reform tended to be *initiated* in a top-down manner, characterized by increased district centralization of curriculum development and textbook selection yet coupled with extensive site-level teacher and administrator participation in implementation. Districts and schools seemed to be "teaming" in reform development and implementation. New and instructionally oriented superintendents and principals played key roles in reform initiation in most districts and schools. Department chairs also played key roles and were becoming more critical to implementation at the site level. Moreover, it was important that the district leadership role not just be "upfront" in proposing the directions for the reform, but continue throughout the entire implementation process in the form of continuing coordination, leadership, pressure, and monitoring.

The final overall theme is that successful state reform implementation in sample schools hinged on a closely aligned vision between the district and schools, and between teachers and administrators in schools. Higher gain schools, according to ratings of the case researchers, were in districts in which the district reform vision was clear and consistent, where district leaders were both highly committed to educational reform (especially to improving basic skills), strong in communicating this commitment to schools, and where schools were moving in the same direction and with the same substantive agenda as the district.

All sample schools, except one junior high school, conducted an effective local implementation process. Every school in the study used some form of "cross-role teaming". Cross-role teams typically were groups that included teachers, department chairs, and site and central office administrators, and were charged with designing and coordinating the implementation process. Cross-role teams blended top-down initiation of the reform direction with bottom-up participation in developing and implementing specific implementation activities and helped produce a closely aligned vision and agenda among teachers, administrators, schools, and districts.

Administrators and teachers in sample schools received initial training to carry out reforms and undertake curriculum development activities. When coupled with administrator leadership, commitment, monitoring and pressure to implement, these initial trainings and corresponding curriculum development activities were sufficient to implement the early phase of revitalizing an academically oriented curriculum.

More substantial changes in curriculum and instruction, beyond the two above-mentioned stages, took increased and continuous amounts of assistance. For site administrators, this assistance often focused on clinical supervision, teacher evaluation, and classroom management strategies. For teachers, this assistance often focused on clinical teaching, classroom management, and general pedagogy. For most sites, however, the quality and extent of assistance was sufficient neither to change dramatically classroom teaching skills nor to support the implementation of the even more demanding curriculum reforms that include thinking, problem solving, communication skills, and cooperative learning.

Student, Personnel, and School Outcomes

In addition to assessing the status of SB 813 policies in 17 secondary schools, study findings include several outcomes for students, teachers, administrators, and schools as organizations; analyses of key variables in effective local implementation processes; and the linkage of special-needs student programs to reform implementation. A number of the outcomes are based on ratings by case researchers, and represent their judgments about the impact and effects of SB 813.

Schools in the sample made substantial gains between 1983-84 and 1986-87 in student achievement, as measured by CAP score gains. Moreover, schools also made gains in school climate, administrator practice, teacher practice, and nontest-score related student variables according to researchers' ratings. Moreover, individual schools made sizeable gains in all of these areas. CAP gains, for example, did not occur at the expense of other outcomes. Further, test score gains were not caused by favorable student or school demographic characteristics.

CAP scores for schools in the sample rose faster than scores statewide, especially in reading. For the sample generally, student 8th and 12th grade CAP test scores increased between 1983-84 and 1986-87. In these high schools, reading gains were double the statewide average. In addition, test scores rose across the range of all students in these schools. There was an increase in students scoring above quartiles 1, 2, and 3 over these three years, which means that students at all levels improved their performance. It was not only the highest performing students who improved their scores; students across the spectrum improved their performance.

School "climate" in the schools studied improved substantially. Based on researcher ratings, school climate improved across several dimensions, including shared sense of a new school vision, level of collegiality in the schools, amount of teacher discussion about curriculum and instruction, and a norm of continuous improvement. SB 813 contributed positively to all these changes. Based on additional researcher ratings designed to gauge either a positive or negative impact of SB 813, the reform bill's contribution was most positive for the norm of continuous improvement.

Administrative expertise and practice also improved as a result of these schools' education improvement efforts according to researcher ratings. Administrators were better able to design district and school goals, manage a new curriculum program, orchestrate its implementation, and engage in clinical supervision of instruction. The most striking result for teachers in the sample schools was their large increase in sense of professional efficacy.

Finally, while CAP scores increased, other student outcomes also improved, but at a somewhat lesser rate. Student performance on both standardized tests and local proficiency tests improved. On the other hand, dropout rates also increased, although marginally.

Special Student Populations

A particularly important finding was that special-needs students were not overlooked in reform implementation. Though not specifically addressed by SB 813, the needs of special student populations are being addressed by schools and districts. Indeed, the trend seemed to be an increase in both the degree of services and the types of approaches used to provide these services. In addition, nearly all program goals were to move students into the mainstream. Put differently, the goals were not to track and retain students in remedial or special programs. While there was variation in accomplishing these goals, the goals were to remedy academic deficiencies in order to equip students to function successfully in a regular curriculum program. Students still may be at-risk, but they are receiving programs and services and are not being ignored.

While the curriculum in most special-needs programs was aligned with the regular, core curriculum of the school, and had increased substantively in academic rigor, it was still somewhat less rigorous and demanding than the regular program. Special program services also tended to focus on basic skills of reading and mathematics, and usually did not include alternative pedagogical approaches to teaching higher level thinking skills. At the same time, the movement towards English as a Second Language (ESL), structured immersion, and sheltered English in the limited-English-proficient (LEP) student programs fits with a general political trend to emphasize the teaching of English, although the traditional bilingual education programs have had teaching English as a primary goal. Regardless of the genuine concern that was evident for students who need additional help, the services provided to them were rather traditional, providing little additional advantages for these students.

Relationship of Outcomes to Process Variables

This section briefly discusses why three categories of outcomes occurred: the above average CAP score gains, increased organizational capacity to engage in substantive education reform, and readiness to engage in an even more complex curriculum change focused on better content, analytic thinking, and problem-solving skills. Appendix I provides additional information on these issues.

The Story of CAP Score Improvements

California Assessment Program gains between December 1983 and December 1986 were calculated for each high school. While the average gain for all schools exceeded the statewide average, three patterns of CAP score gain were identified: (1) high-gain schools with sizeable gains in both reading and mathematics, (2) low-gain schools with smaller gains in both reading and mathematics (but still about the same as the statewide average), and (3) mixed schools for which either reading or mathematics gains, but not both, were sizeable (Table 3).

Patterns of high or low CAP gain were not related to district size or to the ethnic composition of a student body. Similarly, CAP score gains were not related to whether a school's 1983 CAP scores were high or low with respect to the overall statewide average. High-gain schools showed gains dramatically greater than the statewide average gains even though they were demographically typical of all schools in the state. Why then the pattern of CAP score gain?

High CAP gain high schools had reform implementation patterns that were considerably different from low CAP gain schools. High-gain schools were found in districts where the district vision of reform was clear and consistent. Districts with high-gain schools were highly committed to education reform, especially to improving basic skills, and were strong in communicating this commitment to schools.

High-gain schools displayed the following in comparison with low-gain schools:

- more active implementation reform management
- more active use of cross-role teams and implementation plans
- stronger implementation coordination between schools and the district, and among departments within schools
- greater use of initial training [1]
- greater ongoing assistance, from leaders at both the district and school

---

[1] Where initial training was not extensive, administrator pressure and monitoring was especially active. Initial training often took the form of orientation and socialization to a district or school point of view about the program.

TABLE 3: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS AND CAP GAINS

	1	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	14	15	16	17	18	19
1																
2		CAUSAL FACTOR COMPONENTS AND HIGH LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS								CAUSAL FACTOR COMPONENTS AND MIXED CAP GAIN SCHOOLS						
3																
4																
5			HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				MIXED CAP GAIN SCHOOLS					
6																
7	CAUSAL FACTORS	Orange Co.	LA Metro	East Bay	Desert	LA City	Capitol City	D Butte	Norcal	CAUSAL FACTORS	Cent Valley	Peninsula	Tri-County	SoCal HS		
8																
9	G: IMPLEMENTN MGT	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD	LOW	MOD	G: IMPLEMENTN MGT	HIGH	LW-MO	MOD	LOW		
10	CROSS ROLE TM	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	CROSS ROLE TM	HIGH	LW-MO	MOD	LOW		
11	IMPLEMENTN PLAN	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	LW-MD	LOW	LOW	IMPLEMENTN PLAN	HIGH	LOW	MOD	LOW		
12																
13	H: INITIAL TRAINING	MOD	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MOD	LOW	LOW	MOD	H; INITIAL TRAINING	HIGH	MOD	HIGH	MOD		
14	ADM TRAINING	MOD	HIGH	LOW	MOD	MOD	LOW	LOW	MOD	ADM TRAINING	MOD	MOD	MOD	LOW		
15	TCHR TRAINING	MOD	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MOD	LOW	LOW	MOD	TCHR TRAINING	MOD	MOD	HIGH	MOD		
16																
17	J: CURR DEVELPMT	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	J: CURR DEVELPMT	HIGH	MOD	MOD	MOD		
18	QUALITATIVE CHNG	LOW	MOD	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	MOD	QUALITATIVE CHNG	LW-MD	LOW	LOW	LOW		
19	CURR ALIGNMENT	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	CURR ALIGNMENT	HIGH	MOD	MOD	MOD		
20																
21	K: ADM COMMITMENT	HIGH	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	LOW	HIGH	K; ADM COMMITMENT	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MOD		
22	LEADERSHIP	HIGH	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	LOW	HIGH	LEADERSHIP	HIGH	MD-HI	HIGH	MOD		
23	PRESSURE	HIGH	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	PRESSURE	MOD	MOD	LOW	LW-MO		
24	MONITORING	MOD	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	MONITORING	MOD	NA	LOW	LW-MO		
25																
26	L: LATITUDE	MOD	LOW	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW	L; LATITUDE	MOD	NA	HIGH	MOD		
27	FIDELITY	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	MOD	LOW	HIGH	FIDELITY	MOD	NA	LOW	MOD		
28																
29	M: DIST ASSITANCE	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	LOW	MOD	MOD	M: DIST ASSITANCE	MOD	NA	LOW	LOW		
30	SCH ASSISTANCE	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	MOD	LOW	LOW	MOD	SCH ASSISTANCE	MOD	NA	LOW	LOW		
31	EXTERNAL AGENT	MOD	MOD	NONE	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	NONE	EXTERNAL AGENT	NONE	NA	NONE	LOW		
32	INTERNAL AGENT	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	MOD	INTERNAL AGENT	HIGH	NA	MOD	LOW		
33																
34	N: TEACHER EFFORT	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	MIXED	MIXED	MIXED	LOW	LOW	N: TEACHER EFFORT	HIGH	NA	HIGH	MIXED		
35																
36	P: TEACHER SKILLS	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LW-MD	NA	LOW	LW-MD	P: TEACHER SKILLS	HIGH	NA	MOD	MOD		
37																
38	Q: TEACHER COMTMT	LOW	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	LOW	LOW	Q: TEACHER COMTMT	HIGH	NA	HIGH	LOW		
39	INSTITL COMTMT	MOD	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD	INSTITL COMTMT	HIGH	NA	HIGH	LOW		
40																
41	R: EXTENT OF IMP	MOD	MOD-HI	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD	R: EXTENT OF IMP	HIGH	NA	HIGH	NA		
42	DIST IMPLEMENTN	MOD	MOD-HI	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD	DIST IMPLEMENTN	HIGH	NA	HIGH	NA		
43	SCHL IMPLEMENTN	MOD	MOD-HI	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD	SCHL IMPLEMENTN	HIGH	NA	HIGH	NA		
44																
45	OTHER									OTHER						
46	SIP PROGRAM	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	SIP PROGRAM	NO	ACH CNCL	YES	YES		
47	OTHER PROGAMS	COMP ED		AB 551	COMP ED	COMP ED		COMP ED	COMP ED	OTHER PROGAMS	COMP ED	PACKARD	COMP ED			
48	COURT/VOL INTIG	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER	VOL	COURT	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER	COURT/VOL INTIG	NEITHER	COURT	NEITHER	COURT		
49	TOP-DN/BTM-UP	TOP-DOWN	TOP-DOWN	TOP-DOWN	MIXED	TOP-DOWN	MUTUAL	BOTTOM-UP	NA	TOP-DN/BTM-UP	MID-OUT	TOP-DOWN	BOTTOM-UP	MIXED		
50	COUPLING	TIGHT	TIGHT	TIGHT	MODERATE	LOOSE	LOOSE	LOOSE	TIGHT	COUPLING	LOOSE	TIGHT	LOOSE	MIXED		
51	CAP EMPHASIS	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	HIGH	CAP EMPHASIS	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW		
52	INCREASED CNTRL	YES	NO CHANGE	YES	YES	YES	YES	LOW	NO CHANGE	INCREASED CNTRL	YES	YES	YES	NO CHANGE		
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

Curriculum development at high-gain schools was often extensive but was qualitatively not greatly different from the previous curriculum at the school. The pattern in low-gain schools was similar—neither type of school had already developed curriculum that was reflective of the new phases of reform. Both high and low gain schools, however, were active in aligning curriculum with texts, model curriculum standards, and CAP tests.

Ongoing administrative commitment and leadership were uniformly strong in high-gain schools. Conversely, low-gain schools had low commitment and leadership except in the one special case of a one-school district in rural northern California. Administrative pressure and monitoring was high in all but one of the high-gain schools. In that school, administrative commitment and leadership were high even though pressure and monitoring was not extensive. In low-gain schools, administrative pressure and monitoring were uniformly low.

All high-gain schools were tightly aligned with their districts, and most change was top-down initiated. Even so, the extent of program fidelity to the district design (low latitude) varied across schools. Some high-gain schools exercised wide latitude in implementing their programs while others did not. In low-gain schools, the school was either tightly aligned to the district, and the change was bottom-up or nonexistent, or the school was loosely aligned to the district ,but the change was top-down or mutual. Program latitude was often extensive in low-gain schools. In every case, low-gain schools had awkward patterns of school and district alignment, direction of change, and program latitude during implementation.

Teacher effort, skill mastery, and commitment at high-gain schools was dramatically different than at low-gain schools. Two of the four high-gain schools had consistently high ratings for teacher effort, skill mastery, and commitment. The two other schools had modest ratings in these areas but strong ratings for many other implementation variables, especially for site leadership and commitment. In turn, low-gain schools had consistently modest levels of teacher effort, skill mastery, and commitment.

Finally, three of the four high-gain schools placed a considerable emphasis on CAP scores and offered CAP preparation programs for students. All high-gain schools offered strong curricula and programs in mathematics and reading. Low-gain schools typically placed low or modest emphasis on CAP and varied in their emphasis of mathematics and reading.

Schools with low CAP gains between 1984 and 1987, however, tended to have 1984 scores that were at the top of their comparison bands. Consequently, in comparison with similar schools, these schools were doing quite well already in 1983. These schools did improve during the 1983-1987 period, however, because their CAP score gains were similar to the statewide average gain.

Improved Organizational Capacity

Organizational capacity for continuing reform was defined as a combination of improvements in school climate and administrative practice. All the schools studied experienced an increased capacity to carry out quality improvements as a result of their involvement with the reform effort. Gains in school climate and administrative practice have already been reported.[2]

For the analysis reported here, high schools were ranked by gains in school climate and administrative practices and were clustered into high-, moderate-, and low-gain schools. Table 4 presents the ratings for each implementation variable for each school. Table 5 presents the average ratings for high-, moderate-, and low-gain schools after ratings for each implementation variable had been averaged across all sites in each cluster of schools. In calculating the mean, a site rating of "high" was given a 3, a rating of "moderate" was given a 2, and a rating of "low" was given a 1.[3]

Schools with high organizational gains managed reform implementation more effectively. These schools were dramatically better at using cross-role teams and also had better implementation plans. The use of initial training at high organizational gain schools was not different from other schools. Teacher training in both content and pedagogy was not different in high and low organizational CAP gain schools, but administrative training was slightly higher in the high-gain schools. High-gain schools, however, received much more ongoing assistance from both inside and outside the district.

Schools that greatly increased their organizational capacity were similar to other schools in having a moderate amount of curriculum development, including only a minimal amount of qualitatively different curriculum. Like other schools, high-gain schools demonstrated considerable curriculum alignment. In terms of administrative leadership, however, high organizational gain schools differed substantially from other schools. High-gain schools showed considerable ongoing administrative commitment and leadership in implementing reform. Administrative pressure and monitoring were somewhat greater at high-gain schools but not intensive. High-gain schools also experienced more latitude in implementing reforms, with strong school-district alignment and a consistent direction of change.

---

[2] These were obtained from researcher ratings. The methodology is explained in Chapter Three of this report.

[3] Ratings were determined by individual researchers and thus are subject to individual variation.

TABLE 4: THE RELATIONSHIP OF IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS TO ENHANCED CAPACITY FOR ONGOING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: BY SCHOOL SITE

	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	14	15
1						EXTENT OF ENHANCED ORGANIZATION CAPACITY							
2													
3		HIGH					MODERATE				LOW		
4													
5		Central Valley HS	Peninsula HS	Desert HS	Orange Co HS	LA Metro HS	Capitol City HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Norcal HS	East Bay HS	LA City HS	TriCo HS	SoCal HS
6													
7	DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS												
8	ROUND 1&2 CASE STUDIES												
9	POLICY & OUTCOME REPORTS												
10													
11	IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS												
12													
13	G: IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT	HIGH	LOW-MOD	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW
14	CROSS ROLE TEAMING	HIGH	LOW-MOD	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW
15	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW-MOD	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW
16													
17	H: INITIAL TRAINING (CONTENT, SKILL)	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE
18	ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW
19	TEACHER TRAINING	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE
20													
21	J: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE
22	QUALITATIVE CHANGE	LOW-MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	LOW
23	CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE
24													
25	K: ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
26	LEADERSHIP	HIGH	MOD-HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
27	PRESSURE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	LOW-MOD
28	MONITORING	MODERATE	NA	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	LOW-MOD
29													
30	L: PROGRAM LATITUDE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH	LOW	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE
31	DEGREE OF FIDELITY	MODERATE	NA	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE
32													
33	M: DISTRICT ONGOING ASSISTANCE	MODERATE	NA	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	LOW
34	SCHOOL ONGOING ASSISTANCE	MODERATE	NA	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	LOW
35	EXTERNAL LINKING AGENT	NOT USED	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	NOT USED	NOT USED	MODERATE	NOT USED	LOW
36	INTERNAL LINKING AGENT	HIGH	NA	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW
37													
38	N: TEACHER EFFORT	HIGH	NA	MIXED	MODERATE	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	LOW	HIGH	MIXED	HIGH	MIXED
39													
40	P: TEACHER SKILL MASTERY	HIGH	NA	LOW	LOW	HIGH	NA	LOW	LOW-MOD	HIGH	LOW-MOD	MODERATE	MODERATE
41													
42	O: TEACHER COMMITMENT	HIGH	NA	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW
43	INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT	HIGH	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW
44													
45	R: EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION	HIGH	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	MOD-HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	NA
46	DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION	HIGH	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	MOD-HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	NA
47	SCHOOL IMPLEMENTATION	HIGH	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	MOD-HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	NA
48													
49	OTHER COMPARATIVE FIELDS												
50	SIP PROGRAM	NO	ACH COUNC	YES		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
51	OTHER PROG'S (551-65-803-LEP)	SCE-LEP-551-65	PCKRD GRNT	SCE-LEP-CHI	SCE-LEP-CHI			SCE-LEP-IND ED	SCE-LEP-CHI	AB 551	EIA/LEP	SCE-LEP-CH	
52	COURT/VOLUNTARY INTEGRATION	NEITHER	COURT ORDR	VOLUNTARY	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER	COURT ORDER	NEITHER	COURT ORDE
53	TOP-DOWN OR BOTTOM-UP CHANGE	MIDDLE-OUT	TOP-DOWN	MIXED	TOP-DOWN	TOP-DOWN	MUTUAL	BOTTOM UP	NA	TOP-DOWN	TOP-DOWN	BOTTOM-UP	MIXED
54	TIGHT/LOOSE DIST-SCHL COUPLING	LOOSE	TIGHT	MODERATE	TIGHT	TIGHT	LOOSE	LOOSE	TIGHT	TIGHT	LOOSE	LOOSE	MIXED
55	DEGREE OF CAP TEST EMPHASIS	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW
56	INCREASED CENTRALIZATION	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO CHANGE	YES	LOW	NO CHANGE	YES	YES	YES	NO CHANGE
57													
58	OTHER COMMENTS	Availability of	The sch's	813 refs	Prn, prn sec	Dst hs 5 yr	Dst hs 7yr cyc	SB 813 facilitd	Sngl adm sch	Ech sch in	Dpt chrs plyd	Dst laisse fr	SIP prog hd
59		competitive $	Ach Cncl	were sml	2 Vps, &	pln for curr	but not wrtn	chng in dist	w/mny sngl	dst req to	ky role in the	mgt approch	psive infinc
60		facilitd schl	provides SIP	pc of a lrgr	couns left	devolp w/no	impl plan	lckng in adm	tchr depts	devlp site	reform	shifting to be	on reform
61		reform effort	atmosphere	plan	Sp 1986	impl details		leadership		imprv plan	effort	mr directive	effort
62													
63													
64													
65													

73

74

TABLE 5: THE RELATIONSHIP OF IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS TO ENHANCED CAPACITY FOR ONGOING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1		EXTENT OF ENHANCED ORGANIZATION CAPACITY															
2																	
3		HIGH			MODERATE			LOW									
4																	
5																	
6																	
7	DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS																
8	ROUND 1&2 CASE STUDIES																
9	POLICY & OUTCOME REPORTS																
10																	
11	IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS																
12																	
13	G: IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT	MODERATE	2.30		MODERATE		2.00	LOW/MODERATE	1.50								
14	CROSS ROLE TEAMING	HIGH	2.63		LOW/MODERATE		1.50	LOW/MODERATE	1.50								
15	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	MODERATE	2.00		LOW/MODERATE		1.63	LOW/MODERATE	1.50								
16																	
17	H: INITIAL TRAINING (CONTENT, SKILL)	MODERATE	2.00		LOW/MODERATE		1.75	MODERATE	2.00								
18	ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING	MODERATE	2.00		LOW/MODERATE		1.75	LOW/MODERATE	1.50								
19	TEACHER TRAINING	LOW/MODERATE	1.75		LOW/MODERATE		1.75	MODERATE	2.00								
20																	
21	J: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	MODERATE	2.00		HIGH		2.50	MODERATE	2.25								
22	QUALITATIVE CHANGE	LOW	1.10		LOW/MODERATE		1.50	LOW	1.25								
23	CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT	HIGH	2.50		HIGH			HIGH	2.50								
24																	
25	K: ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT	HIGH	3.00		MODERATE		2.00	MODERATE	2.25								
26	LEADERSHIP	HIGH	2.88		MODERATE		2.00	MODERATE	2.25								
27	PRESSURE	MODERATE	2.00		LOW/MODERATE		1.50	LOW	1.38								
28	MONITORING	LOW/MODERATE	1.67		LOW/MODERATE		1.50	LOW	1.38								
29																	
30	L: PROGRAM LATITUDE	MODERATE	2.33		LOW/MODERATE		1.50	MODERATE	2.25								
31	DEGREE OF FIDELITY	LOW/MODERATE	1.67		MODERATE		2.25	MODERATE	2.00								
32																	
33	M: DISTRICT ONGOING ASSISTANCE	LOW	1.25		LOW/MODERATE		1.75	LOW/MODERATE	1.70								
34	SCHOOL ONGOING ASSISTANCE	MODERATE	2.00		MODERATE		2.00	LOW/MODERATE	1.50								
35	EXTERNAL LINKING AGENT	HIGH	2.50		LOW		1.33	LOW/MODERATE	1.50								
36	INTERNAL LINKING AGENT	MODERATE	2.33		LOW/MODERATE		1.75	LOW/MODERATE	1.50								
37																	
38	N: TEACHER EFFORT	MODERATE	2.33		LOW/MODERATE		1.75	HIGH	2.50								
39																	
40	P: TEACHER SKILL MASTERY	LOW/MODERATE	1.67		LOW/MODERATE		1.83	HIGH	2.83								
41																	
42	Q: TEACHER COMMITMENT	MODERATE	2.33		LOW/MODERATE		1.75	MODERATE	2.00								
43	INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT	HIGH	2.67		LOW/MODERATE		1.75	MODERATE	2.25								
44																	
45	R: EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION	HIGH	2.67		LOW/MODERATE		1.88	MODERATE	2.33								
46	DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION	HIGH	2.67		LOW/MODERATE		1.88	MODERATE	2.33								
47	SCHOOL IMPLEMENTATION	HIGH	2.67		LOW/MODERATE		1.88	MODERATE	2.33								
48																	
49	OTHER COMPARATIVE FIELDS																
50	SIP PROGRAM																
51	OTHER PROG'S (551-65-803-LEP)																
52	COURT/VOLUNTARY INTEGRATION																
53	TOP-DOWN OR BOTTOM-UP CHANGE																
54	TIGHT/LOOSE DIST-SCHL COUPLING																
55	DEGREE OF CAP TEST EMPHASIS																
56	INCREASED CENTRALIZATION																
57																	
58	OTHER COMMENTS																
59																	
60																	
61																	
62																	
63																	
64																	
65																	

At the teacher level, it was hard to differentiate high, moderate, and low organizational capacity gain schools. Teacher effort was about the same at high-gain schools as at other schools. Skill mastery gains, however, favored low-gain schools, largely because two of the four high-gain schools implemented reforms where skill mastery was not a critical issue. In most of the high organizational capacity gain schools, teacher commitment to reform was high, but this also was true of low-gain schools.[4]

Toward a More Complex Reform Agenda

Secondary schools in the study easily and quickly changed old course offerings and implemented more traditional, academic courses. This seemed to be the nature of the initial response to SB 813 and other reform stimuli. These changes required few new instructional strategies for teachers, although they did require staff development which was provided to all teachers and administrators and was linked directly to these first-phase reform goals. Secondary school teachers preferred to teach more academic courses than "general track" courses or even many of the electives. They had been trained to teach academic courses, and they did not need additional training or help to begin teaching more of them. The study found wide progress in sample schools on these types of improvements.

However, it was much more difficult for schools to change the nature of teaching strategies or to change the general nature of the curriculum, such as proposed in California's (and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and Science) new mathematics and science curriculum frameworks. It was even more difficult to inject a greater degree of emphasis into the curriculum in areas such as thinking, problem solving, and communication skills. These new practices entail substantial change on the part of teachers and require sophisticated training programs to develop such new pedagogical expertise. The study found less progress on these dimensions of improvement.

Thus, the study found that SB 813 helped several schools and districts to restore their curriculum to traditional notions of academic excellence. The study also found these schools poised to implement a substantially strengthened curriculum program with an emphasis on analytic thinking and problem solving skills, but the study also found few articulated and consistent strategies for doing so.

Some districts had plans for expanding the curriculum and instruction focus to these issues and had begun district-school conversations about an appropriate implementation process. Other districts already had incorporated these new directions into detailed curriculum guides and had begun new staff development efforts for teachers. None of the districts had extensive or intensive staff training or new curriculum materials in place.

---

[4] "Teacher effort" was determined from individual researcher ratings.

Several districts, however, have been preparing department chairs and teachers to facilitate implementation of these new directions.

Policy Implications and Suggestions

One implication pertains to the relationship between early state initiatives and subsequent local efforts to improve secondary schools. The study found that state improvement efforts in curriculum and instruction, such as included in SB 813, can interact with local initiative to improve secondary schools. Local implementation processes are critical to the success of such improvements, and a common local implementation process is successful across schools that differ ethnically, geographically, and demographically.[5] Thus, one clear policy implication is that the state should disseminate information about effective local change processes and encourage, if not stimulate, other districts and schools to develop such processes.

Key structural elements of such a local improvement process should include:

1. A district and school vision that focuses on rigorous curriculum content and effective teaching strategies.

2. A district team, consisting of district staff, site administrators, and teachers, that plans and coordinates the overall implementation activities.

3. A district implementation plan for coordinating and linking the elements (curriculum objectives, texts and instructional materials, teaching strategies, and texts) of the technical core of curriculum and instruction, and that includes an interrelated set of implementation activities over a multiple year time frame.

4. Strategically targeted staff development, linked to the curriculum content and pedagogical skills teacher need to teach the curriculum, relying heavily on mentor teachers to implement, and that provides significantly more on-going and follow-through assistance than simply initial training.

5. District monitoring of student, teacher, and site administrator performance, of faithful program implementation, and of the consistency of school emphases with district substantive directions.

6. A school team of site administrators, department chairs, and teachers that plans and coordinates the specific school implementation activities. This team either should be the

---

[5] The study found that implementation processes were different for schools in the largest, urban districts, primarily because these districts had several factors, such as desegregation mandates, other than the state's initiatives in SB 813 dictating the use of their time and resources. At the same time, initiatives in most of the urban districts studied also targeted core curriculum and instruction for improvement.

school's "curriculum council" or should be tightly connected to such a council or to the principal's cabinet.

7 . Assistance to teachers to put the curriculum and instructional strategies into skilled classroom practice.

Another policy implication concerns the role of staff development in education reform. The study found that teachers' instructional strategies had improved but not that much. While districts have provided considerable initial staff development and training, follow-through efforts and assistance in implementing the new curriculum and pedagogy in classrooms have been provided only sporadically. Research shows that this follow-through assistance is critical to substantial classroom impact.

Our impression was that many teachers needed additional subject matter and pedagogical expertise to implement a new curriculum that both changes substantively the content in mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts, and emphasizes numeric reasoning, critical thinking, written communication, problem solving, cooperative learning, and peer tutoring. If this view is correct, staff development–indeed, massive human resources development–would be needed to enhance the classroom impact of current and future reform efforts. As the curriculum focus becomes more substantive, and indeed becomes more intertwined with technology, this heavy emphasis on staff development and training should not be a surprise. Moreover, staff development must be tied to other implementation strategies.

One possible staff development policy option is to expand and focus the Mentor Teacher program. The scope of needed staff development could justify creation of either greater numbers of mentors or more mentor time devoted to reform focused staff development. Mentor activities, moreover, could be focused more directly on new district and state efforts to implement a restructured curriculum designed to develop deeper content knowledge and thinking and problem solving skills.

Finally, the study documented a genuine concern for students who need extra help in mastering the regular curriculum program, and who likely will need even additional help to master a curriculum that emphasizes thinking and problem solving skills. The study also found that while services to these students had increased in sample schools, the services themselves were rather traditional and of the type that had produced insufficient achievement in the past. Thus, it follows that California will need to fund the development of new instructional approaches for providing extra services to low-achieving, limited-English-proficient, low-income, and at-risk-of dropping-out students that produce larger effects. This new thrust could include funds for research to develop new programs, regulation waiving for local schools to experiment with new approaches, or some combination of the two. The fact is that education excellence, so far, has not left at-risk students unnoticed, but the education system's strategies for dealing with at-risk students need strengthening. The will is there, but new ways are needed to make these programs more effective.

Appendix A

Implementation of State Policies Research Instruments

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Increased High School Graduation/CSU UC Entrance Requirements

Effective in the 1986-87 school year, new requirements for receipt of a high school diploma are enforced. S.B. 813 mandates certain requirements for high school graduation; the State Board has also developed its own recommendations. These requirements are given below, along with the new CSU/UC requirements. Numbers refer to years.

	S.B. 813 Requirements	State Board Recommendations	CSU Required 1988	UC Required 1988
English	3	4	4	4
Math	2	3	3	3
Algebra	-	(1)		
Geometry	-	(1)		
Science	2	2	1	1
Physical	(1)	(1)		
Life	(1)	(1)		
Social Studies	3	3	1	1
World Civ.	(1)	(1)	(this year may be taken as one year of of U.S. History or .5 year U.S. History amd .5 year Civics or American Goverment)	
U.S. Hist.	(1)	(1)		
Ethics	-	(.5)		
Am. Gov.	(1)	-		
Economics	-	(.5)		
Foreign Lang.	1 (or Fine Arts)	2 (in same language)	2	2
Fine Arts	1 (or Foreign Lang)	1	1	
Computer Studies	-	(.5)		
Physical Education	2			
Electives			3	4

Note: Subsequent legislation has mandated 0.5 year of economics for high school graduation.

****

1. What are the high school graduation requirements in this district/school?
2. Compare them to the S.B. 813 and State Board graduation requirements and the CSU/UC entrance requirements.
3. Find out more about the course changes - in which areas were courses added -

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDE

2. Model Curriculum Standards

To assist local school districts in upgrading course content, S.B. 813 required the SEA to develop Model Curriculum Standards for the mandated graduated requirements. School districts are required to compare their local curriculum to the Model Standards at least once every three years. The Model Curriculum Standards are intended to serve as a model, not a mandate. The Standards have been designed to allow Boards as much flexibility as possible in making comparisons, and in implementating strategies and details. The content that should be covered by the time students have completed, for example, three years of English, is clear in general terms but can be accomplished in a variety of different ways. Model Curriculum Standards have been developed for grades 9-12 in the following subject matter areas:

*English/Language Arts
*Foreign Language
*History-Social Science
*Mathematics
*Science
*Visual and Performing Arts

****

1. What is the district/school process for changing curriculum and/or for developing new courses?

2. For which subject areas has the school changed its curriculum? Describe the nature of the changes.

3. How is the school changing its curriculum program? Who is developing its curriculum objectives, scopes, sequences and continuums?

4. What are the names of texts and tests are being used? How are they aligned with the curriculum objectives?

5. Describe how the school is/is not using the state's model curriculum standards? Detail for each subject area.

6. Who is teaching the new courses and the added sections? What are teachers who used to teach courses that have been dropped doing now?

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDE

3. Changes in Textbooks Adopted

California high schools, grades 9-12, adopt textbooks based on their own district policies. Textbook selection for a given subject occurs every six years. This year, the subjects for which texts were selected include science, social studies, ESL, English, and economics.

Junior and middle schools must select texts from a state adopted list of texts when spending state textbook funds. The state is requiring publishers to cover content in greater substantive depth, to include higher level teaching skills as well as basic content and knowledge skills, and to cover in a neutral but objectively sound way some traditionally controversial topics.

****

1. What is the district/school textbook adoption process?

2. What are the names of new texts the school has selected? Why were the textbooks adopted?

3. How are they different from previous texts?

4. How did they address the alignment of text and curriculum objectives? Do the new texts "fit" with the model curriculum guides and changes in California's assessment testing program?

5. How are the state's changes in textbook adoption criteria affecting the texts used in the school?

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDE

4. New Tests - CAP and Others

California Assessment Program

Statewide testing of all California third, sixth, and twelth graders has been conducted since 1973. It has used a matrix sampling technique and a criterion-referenced text. This testing program uses questions specifically designed to match California's school curriculum. Beginning in May 1984, eighth-grade students also were tested in reading and mathematics; the eight grade science test is being piloted this year; tenth-grade exams will be added in the near future. Reading, math, and written language are assessed currently; future tests will include writing samples, as well as science, history-social science, and critical thinking across all content areas tested. The current 12th grade reading and math test has not yet been revised and therefore, is not aligned with the model curriculum guides.

****

1. Discuss how the new and proposed changes in state testing have or have not affected the curriculum program of the school.

2. Describe any new emphases on teaching analytic thinking, problem solving skills in the curriculum; describe by subject area.

3. Describe new emphases on content changes in different academic areas?

4. Have local district/school/classroom tests changed recently? If so, what is the nature of the change?

5. If appropriate, ask teachers for last two unit exams given.

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

5. SI Program Quality Review Criteria

Until recently, the School Improvement (SI) Program Quality Review was conducted by State Department monitors and emphasized program services for special needs students. In 1983-84, the program quality review guides were changed and the program quality review function was decentralized to the local level. Now, the program quality review focuses on the quality of the school curriculum program and the degree to which categorical services for special student populations reinforce the core, curriculum program. These changes specify in more detail the substance of local SI programs and signal that SI can be used as a program for implementing curriculum change in response to education reform mandates. Further, consortia of local educators now conduct program quality reviews, thus removing the state from the local review process.

****

1. Describe the impact on your school's SI programs of the changes in the program quality review criteria.

2. To what degree has your SI program been used to help the school respond to the changes required by S.B. 813?

3. Describe how the review itself is different, more/less effective, etc., now that it is conducted by local educators and not state monitors.

4. Specifically describe how the revised SI program quality review criteria have altered the way the school organizes and delivers additional categorical program services under Chapter I, State EIA, bilingual and special education.

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

6. Mentor Teacher Program

The California Mentor Teacher Program provides state-funded stipends for up to 5% of permanent classroom teachers in California. In order to qualify for a stipend, a candidate must be a credentialed, permanent classroom teacher, have substantial recent teaching experience, and have demonstrated exemplary teaching ability.

A selection committee, composed of a majority of classroom teachers, nominates candidates for mentor positions. Candidates are selected by the school board from those nominated by the committee. Mentors receive a $4,000 stipend above their regular salary for performing any of the following duties, as determined by the district:

- o Provide assistance and guidance to new teachers (a mentor's primary function).
- o Provide assistance and guidance to more experienced teachers.
- o Provide curriculum development.

The only restrictions placed on mentors are that they must spend at least 60% of their time "in direct instruction of students," and they may not evaluate other teachers.

Districts are provided funding for other support costs associated with the program. In the 1983-84 and 1984-85 school years districts received $2,000 per mentor to cover those costs.

Typical duties for mentor teachersaccording to a recent study are summarized below:

	Spring 1984	Summer 1984	Academic Year 1984-85
Roles as yet undetermined	5%	4%	13%
Classroom or other assistance to beginning teachers	7	5	41
Classroom or other assistance to teacher trainees	2	1	12
Staff development or consultation with individual teachers, on request	17	14	53
Conduct school or district staff development	14	18	50
Assist experienced teachers in new subject areas or grade levels	7	7	32
Curriculum development for district needs	21	35	42
Assist teachers with curriculum materials	16	22	42
Other	2	6	5
(Total 490 mentors)			

Source: Far West Laboratories

****

1. Describe the processes the school/district uses to select Mentor Teachers.
2. Describe the categories of activities in which Mentor Teachers engage (by elementary and secondary level) and give approximate percentage breakdowns of activities by category.
3. Describe how the district/school uses Mentor Teachers as part of broader staff development.
4. Describe how the district/school uses Mentor Teacher developed curriculum.
5. Describe how the district uses the $2000 administration support funds for each Mentor Teachers.

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

7. Other Local Staff Development

1. Describe the school/district's overall staff development strategies and activities.
2. Does the district/school benefit from staff development and other assistance provided by the County TEC Center? If so, what are the benefits and how does the school receive them?

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

8. Certification of Teacher Evaluators/New Teacher Evaluation Systems

S.B. 813 provided for the certification of teacher evaluators. In order for school districts to receive school apportionments from the State School Fund, on or before 12/1/84, they must have adopted regulations establishing the certification of personnel assigned to evaluate teachers. These teacher evaluators must have demonstrated competence in instructional methodologies and evaluation for the teachers they are assigned to evaluate. Personnel are to be competent in the following areas:

- o Instructional leadership--the ability of an administrator to provide education as well as managerial direction.
- o Curriculum knowledge of the content, structure, scope, and sequence of what students are being taught.
- o Instruction--knowledge of how students are taught, including multiple teaching methodologies to reflect multiple learning styles.
- o Assessment--what students are learning, the ability to use data to set performance standards and make program decisions.
- o School climate--the ability to create and sustain supportive and appropriate learning environments for students and school staffs.
- o Staff development--knowledge of and commitment to assessing and providing staff development tied to district curriculum, instructional priorities, and teacher needs.
- o Supervision--knowledge of and ability to supervise teachers through observation conferencing, and staff development, as well as professional responsibilities to evaluate teaching performance.
- o Evaluation and documentation--ability to use state laws, district policies, contract provisions and appropriate supervision techniques to recognize superior performance and to correct poor performance.

In addition, administrators need to know district procedures for diagnosing student needs, how the curricular instructional program meets those needs, and how assessment data are used to support revisions in instruction. An effective teacher evaluation system is built upon local needs and services and the administrator should have a strong ability to motivate staff and supervise instruction, as well as evaluate teaching performance.

****

1. How did the district/school certify supervisors to be teacher evaluators? If training was provided, be as specific about the substance of the training as possible, including the degree to which supervisors received follow-up coaching and assistance as they attempted to use the new skills in teacher evaluation activities?

2. Describe the new teacher evaluation system implemented as part of S.B. 813. What were the key changes? Who conducts teacher evaluations?

3. How do teachers view these new directions in teacher evaluations?

9. Other Local Staff Development for Administrators

1. Describe the substance and process of other staff development for local administrators? Who gets it? How do they get it? Who provides it? What are its purposes?

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

10. School Improvement

The State envisions SI as a catalyst for strengthening the local capacity for on-going school reform as well as a vehicle for a broader range array of locally-defined improvements in schools. The SI program features state funding of about $100/pupil for a local process of school improvement that includes:

- a planning process leading to a school-wide multi-year plan for local reform effort
- a school site council consisting of students, parents, teachers and administrators which governs the school reform effort
- staff development and other implementation support strategies conducted at the local site
- continual monitoring of the program by the local school site council and on-going revision of the goals and strategies of the local change effort selected in the yearly resubmissions of the local plan to the state
- program reviews of the local effort by trained review teams consisting of peers from nearby districts.

In general, the SI program focuses on a broad array of improvements of school quality rather than on test score improvement alone.

****

1. What are the major substantive foci of the school's education improvement program?

2. How does the school address departmental as well as school-wide issues in its plan?

3. To what degree is the SI program used to help implement the school's response to education reform?

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

11. Homework Policies

S.B. 813 required each district to develop a homework policy.

****

1. What is the district/school homework policy?
   Be specific about policy by subject area, whether the policy requires coordination across subject areas, differences by grade level.
2. When was it implemented?
3. Does the new policy require more homework than what had been assigned previously? If so, is the homework collected, corrected, and returned?

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

12. Tenth Grade Counseling

Districts may establish a comprehensive program of counseling for pupils reaching the age of 16, or for pupils prior to the end of the 10th grade, whichever occurs first. The counseling program must review the pupil's academic progress and educational options, and design an academic program that would lead to high school graduation. Districts are eligible to receive $20 per 10th grade pupil for counseling services provided in 1983-84 and in 1984-85 for services which supplement, but do not supplant, existing services.

* * *

1. Describe the school's program for counseling tenth grade students. How was more counseling provided? By hiring new counselors? Or how?
2. How are the students' academic progress recorded and reviewed?
3. What types of students benefit most from the program? Those in top quartile, those in the two middle quartiles, at-risk students?
4. What follow-up services are provided to the students after development of an appropriate academic plan?
5. What do you know about whether the program works, i.e., do students take the course of studies the counselor suggests, and are they successful in it?
6. Any related, and broader responses in the school's counseling program?

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

13. Longer Day/Year Incentives

In 1984-85, districts operating school for at least 180 days were entitled to an additional $35/ADA, exclusive of adult ADA and summer school ADA. Thereafter, districts needed to maintain the 180 day instructional year in order to retain the $35/ADA bonus.

Based upon the number of instructional minutes offered in 1982-83, instructional minutes offered in 1983-84, districts received a bonus of $20/ADA in grades K-8 and $40/ADA in grades 9-12 for each of three years if they increased the number of instructional minutes 1/3 of the distance per year toward or met and maintained the following goals:

*36,000 annual minutes in Kindergarten
*50,000 annual minutes in grades 1-3, inclusive
*54,400 annual minutes in grades 4-8, inclusive
*64,800 annual minutes in grades 9-12, inclusive

Schools had several options for increasing the school day or year. Some examples include:

*adding a homeroom where none previously existed
*increasing the passing time between class periods
*increasing the minutes of each period
*increasing the number of school days in the year.

****

1. What is the length of the school's day and year? How many periods in a day? How long is each period?

2. Changes in the past four years?

3. How has the school used any extra time? Be as specific as possible.

4. If the school added inservice days as part of extending the school year, how have those inservice days been used. e.g., topics covered, processes used, etc.?

5. Have longer school days or year contributed to increases in student performance?

4. STATE POLICY INTERVIEW GUIDES

14. Quality Indicators

The first phase of the State's Quality Indicators accountability program was to identify the measures against which educational progress will be judged and to establish goals for statewide improvement. A comprehensive set of accountability measures was developed which include the following state quality indicators:

- o increased enrollment in Math, English, Science, History/Social Studies, Foreign Language, and Fine Arts
- o improved statewide test scores
- o reduced dropout rates and increased attendance rates
  increased performance of the college-bound on the SAT, AP exams, and College Board achievement tests.

Statewide targets for improvement through 1990 were established for each quality indicator.

The accountability program also asked districts and schools to establish their own local targets and improvement strategies to help meet the state goals. Such local quality indicators could draw on a larger body of evidence and address:

- o the strength of the school's curriculum, describing what is being taught, and how well students are learning what they are being taught
- o the school's vitality and harmony, providing evidence that students are functioning within a positive learning environment
- o the amount and quality of writing assignments completed by students
- o the amount and quality of homework assignments completed by students
- o the number and types of books read by students
- o the support the school receives from the community and parents
- o the awards and recognition received by the school, its teachers, and students
- o the nature and quality of support the school provides students with special needs
- o the participation by students in extracurricular activities

****

1. What effect has the State's published quality indicators had on your school/district?

2. Has the school produced a local complement to the state distributed quality indicators? Why, or why not? What does the local document include? How does it complement the state document? (If there is a local document, ask for a copy).

OPEN-ENDED SUMMARY QUESTIONS

1. What do you feel the overall impact of S.B. 813 has been?
   Has it increased "academic press?"
   Has it produced changes in the curriculum?

2. Has the overall impact been good or bad for kids?
   - For the college-bound?
   - For the middle-track?
   - For those eligible for categorical programs?
   - For at-risk kids?
   - On the drop-out rate?
   - On enrollments in continuation schools?

4. STATE POLICY DESCRIPTION SHEETS

Policy ______________________ Data Collector ____________
School ______________________ Date ____________________

a. Description of the policy as implemented: (content, activities, degree of spread across school, types/numbers of staff/pupils affected. Be sure to relate to the core components of the policy and the key implementation requirements. Be sensitive to possible differences at the district and school levels).

b. View of policy/program at local school: (e.g., as program, as catalyst for continuing improvement, as funding source, as mandate to be complied with, etc.)

Interaction of policy/program with other state policies: (which policies, nature of relationship, reasons for relationship)

Initiation/Adoption/Implementation Process: (Tell the story of implementation using key implementation factors as much as possible. Be richly descriptive, outline the chronology of events, and the role of the key actors. This is not an analytic nor interpretive task).

First Round of Data Collection

Overview: The focus of the Round One Case Study is on the overall school reform effort as seen and carried out by district and school personnel rather than on individual S.B. 813 state policies. Provide a concise description of the school and its surrounding community. Focus on demographic, political and economic/fiscal variables.

Conception/Initiation of Reform

A. District. Describe the conception of reform at the district level. Include: content of reform, types of pupils to be served, importance relative to other priorities, relationship to S.B. 813, rationale, coherence, consensus, degree of integration/fragmentation, formality, resource support, how conception was influenced by local mediating variables, etc.

B. District history. Describe the history of the reform conception at the district level. Include: origins, similarity to previous reform efforts, time frame and critical events, content over time, reasons for evolution, role of S.B. 813, etc.

C. District adoption of S.B. 813. Describe the process by which curriculum-instructional improvement/educational reform was initiated/adopted by the district. Include: key players, decision making processes, key issues considered, sequence of events, rationale for action, extent that S.B. 813 was seen to fit at district level, etc.

D. School. Describe the conception of reform at the school level. Include: content of reform, importance relative to other priorities, relationship to S.B. 813, relationship to district conception, coherence, consensus, formality, how school conception was influenced by local mediating variables, resource support, etc.

E. School history. Describe the history of the reform conception at the school level. Include: origins, similarity to previous reform efforts, time frame and critical events, content over time, reasons for evolution, role of S.B. 813.

F. School adoption of S.B. 813. Describe the process by which curriculum-instruction improvement/education reform was initiated/adopted by the school. Include: key players, decision making process, key issues considered, sequence of events, rationale for action, extent that district and school conception of S.B. 813 was seen to fit at school, etc.

Initial Implementation

A. District. Describe the way the district structured initial implementation of its education reform effort. Be sure to keep clear what the reform is during initial implementation. Include: initial mobilization and planning processes for implementation, key players, role of teachers, teacher organizations, site administrators, district line and staff personnel, strategies, critical implementation problems as perceived/resolved, sources of information and assistance from inside and outside the district, sources of monitoring and pressure for the implementation of the overall reform effort, relation to site level initial implementation -- design and practice.

Also include how the implementation of various parts of S.B. 813 were integrated/not integrated with each other and with other district reform/maintenance efforts, committees, decision making structures, etc. Describe the role of S.B. 813 in early implementation.

B. School. Describe the way the school structured initial implementation of its education reform effort. Be sure to keep clear what the reform is during initial implementation. Include: initial mobilization and planning processes for implementation, key players, role of teachers, teacher organizations, site administrators, district line and staff personnel, strategies, critical implementation problems as perceived/resolved, sources of information and assistance from inside and outside the district, sources of monitoring and pressure for the implementation of the overall reform effort, relation to district level initial implementation--design and practice, and patterns of teacher/administrator morale during this phase of implementation.

Also include how the implementation of various parts of S.B. 813 were integrated/not integrated with each other and with other school or district reform/maintenance efforts, committees, decision making structures, etc.

Appendix B

Local Implementation Research Instruments

101

6. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

NEW DISTRICT GOALS AND VISION
(A)

District vision is the articulation of the ideal view of the district stated in the form of goals. They are broad themes, publicly stated and supported by activities of the school board, central office staff, line administrators and superintendents. These themes may be communicated in a variety of ways, either formally or informally.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. What are the goals of the district?
2. Who took the key roles(s) in articulating these goals?
3. How well are these goals articulated and understood outside the central district office?
4. What activities are undertaken by the superintendent, district staff and the school board to support their goals?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

INITIAL CENTRAL OFFICE COMMITMENT
(B)

The school board, superintendent and line administrators provide initial commitment by explicitly stating to the schools that the new program(s) is a priority. Further commitment may be technical, symbolical, or public, but it is all explicitly manifested. Central office commitment reflects a belief that the program is good for the district and will help it meet district goals. Central office commitment connotes a feeling that the program is being adopted because it is important rather than because it is just an opportunity to achieve something else, such as additional funding. Commitment often is represented by a central office line or staff person who serves as an advocate for the new program, fighting and pushing for its adoption, and for resources to support its implementation.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. How do the school board, superintendent and central office administrators demonstrate their commitment to the new programs?
2. How well, authentic, is their commitment/advocacy viewed?
3. Why do you think they are committed to the program?
4. Is there a primary central office program advocate?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

PERCEPTION OF PROGRAM FIT
(C)

Program fit falls into two categories: personal, or user, and organizational. **Personal fit** may appear in three categories. Users connect perception of program fit to congenial ways of relating to pupils. If the users see the program directly relating to pupils, there may be a good perception of fit. Secondly, the meaning is related to the familiarity of the innovation. A good fit occurs when the skills demanded to implement the innovation are those already mastered or familiar to the users. Users feel that they are capable of implementing the innovation with few demands placed upon them. Finally, there is a normative dimension to goodness of fit. A good perception of fit is developed when users perceive the content of the innovation as something they believe in or that they feel the students need, even if they will need to work hard to develop new skills to implement the program.

The goodness of **organizational fit** is judged by district and site administrators. It is the feeling that the innovation fits with the needs and priorities of the district (or school) vision, not just now, but also in the future. The demandingness, or stress ratio, of the innovation can be an indicator of program fit. Demandingness is the amount of institutional change compared to likely rewards. If the ratio is low, meaning either low demands or high rewards, administrators have a good perception of program fit. Similarly, administrators perceive those programs with few potential problems and many potential benefits as providing a good fit. Again, these benefits must be in line with the vision and goals.

KEY QUESTIONS:

Organization Fit (District and Site)

1. How well does the program fit with your district (school) needs? Priorities? Goals? Vision?
2. How demanding will the new program be on your organization? What is the amount of institutional change required to implement the new program?
3. What do you see as the major benefits of the program? What will it do for for the school district?
4. Compare the problems of implementing the new program to the potential benefits received from the program? Do the benefits or problems weight more in your view?

User Fit

1. How well is the new program directly related to students?
2. How much do you believe in the new program?
3. How well do you believe the program addresses student needs?
4. How familiar are you with the skills needed to implement the new program? What kinds of demands will it place on you? Have you already mastered the skills necessary to implement the program?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

INITIAL SITE ADMINISTRATION COMMITMENT
(D)

The school site administrator provides commitment initially by explicitly stating to the school staff and faculty that the new program(s) is a priority. Further commitment may be technical, symbolic, or public, but it is all explicitly stated. The principal often serves as an advocate for the program, fighting and pushing for its adoption, thus visibly demonstrating commitment. Commitment is expressed in such a way as to demonstrate that the program is being adopted because the principal thinks it is truly important rather than because it's an opportunity to achieve something else, such as funding or publicity.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. How does the school site administrator demonstrate his or her commitment to the new program?
2. How well is the commitment/advocacy demonstrated, i.e., how do teachers perceive the commitment?
3. Why do you think he or she is committed to the program?

105

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE SHEETS

SCHOOL VISION
(E)

School vision is the articulation of the ideal view of the school stated in the form of goals. They are broad themes, publicly stated and supported by activities of the site administrator. These themes may be communicated in a variety of ways, either formally or informally. The school may view their vision as compatible with that of the district. It is possible that the vision is in conflict with the district vision. Many schools have their own agenda and simply pick and choose among the elements of the district goals those that fit with the school. Some schools view the district's vision as irrelevant or do not understand it and therefore ignore it. This is especially true if the district vision is incompatible with the school vision.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. What are the goals of the school?
2. Who took the key roles in articulating these goals?
3. How well are these goals articulated and understood by teachers and administrators in the school?
4. What activities are undertaken by the site administrator to support this statement of goals?
5. How does the school vision relate to the district vision? Is it compatible? If not, why not?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

PROGRAM ADOPTION
(F)

Adoption takes place at both the district and school level. Program adoption is also the nature of the program, initially conceived, that has been selected for implementation (as opposed to how the program looks over time). The program may appear wholistic and integrated into the entire school vision, or it may appear isolated and fragmented. If the program is perceived as isolated, it is viewed as a special program, not as a part of the total school reform. If it is perceived as integrated, it is perceived as a long-term program that will eventually lose its special identity.

The location of key decision-makers affects the time needed for program adoption. At the **district level**, if the decision-maker is in a key position, such as central office administrator, the time to adopt a program generally can be short. When central staff promote the project, a clear message is sent to principals to get into line, even if they have some reservations.

Adoption at the **school level** can be facilitated by department chairs who serve as key decision makers. Teachers are generally absent from this process, and rarely consulted. On the other hand, teachers may participate in informal meetings where the concept of a new program is discussed.

KEY QUESTIONS:
(See Case Study Outline for additional questions)

1. Who initiated program adoption at the district level. At the school level?
2. How long was the time from program initiation to adoption?
3. How is the reform program defined? What is in it? Be precise and comprehensive.
4. How is the reform program integrated into the entire school vision? If so, how?
5. How does the reform program handle services for special student populations - compensatory, bilingual and special education - reinforce the core curriculum, or are they seen as separate?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT
(G)

Cross Role Teams are one component of implementation management. These teams include principals, teachers, central office line staff and sometimes community members and external consultants. There may be district as well as school teams; their purpose is to develop the specifics for implementing the reform plan. Team members represent a wide range of perspectives, yet are willing to work together towards school improvement. Teacher members may not necessarily be the most effective teachers. They may have been selected because their schedules more conveniently fit with other members or because they represent a range of teacher perspectives. Some teachers may be new while others may be more experienced.

Teams often are trained so that they understand the school improvement process and the philosophy that guides it. All members, thus, might share a common understanding of the reform program, have better honed process skills, hold a deeper belief that all students can improve, and use a common language to discuss the program and its implementation needs.

Major tasks in which the teams can engage include data collection to determine problems, needs, and goals, data analysis, problem diagnosis, a search for potential solutions, and the development of school improvement implementation plans. The teams also can help assure school level orchestration of the improvement process by determining training needs for each step of the process, monitoring the process to assure that it is moving ahead, and identifying problems as they occur. As more and more staff become involved in the process during later implementation states, team members coordinate activities to insure good communication. Finally, cross-role teams may have control over discretionary dollars for teacher release time, materials, or other options. This responsibility can lead to the team's belief that they are trusted to make good decisions.

KEY QUESTIONS - Answer for both the district and the school:

1. Is there a team that manages program implementation?
2. Who are the members and how were they selected?
3. How were team members trained?
4. What were the outcomes of the training?
5. How interested are team members in school improvement?
6. What are the responsibilities/tasks/functions of the team?
7. How do the teams carry-out their responsibilities/tasks/functions?

The Implementation Plan is a second component of implementation management. The plan should outline key activities, strategies, roles and functions. The existence of an implementation plan at both the district and school level, including the roles of all personnel involved, is essential to implementation management. The strategies for program implementation should be well-defined and articulated to staff. Key roles for all actors - principals, teachers, central office staff, consultants - should be outlined for each implementation stage. Key activities should be scheduled clearly. A district, and perhaps school coordinator, is often appointed to manage program implementation to ensure continuing support. The coordinator is responsible for problem-solving, coordinating each step of implementation, ensuring allocation of resources, consciously using a research base for dealing with people's concerns over time, and providing ongoing support and management. Some plans explicitly use instruments that measure SOCs and LOUs to determine the types of activities for various stages of program implementation.

108

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. Is there an overall implementation plan?
2. If so, please describe it in detail.
3. What are the strategies for program implementation? The activities that support each strategy?
4. Who is the coordinator for the program (at both the district and school level)?
5. What are the responsibilities of the coordinator?
6. How are people's concerns dealt with at different stages of implementation? That is, is an SOC and/or LOU instrument administered and used?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

INITIAL CONTENT, SKILL, AWARENESS TRAINING
(H)

Initial awareness, content and skill training includes training in the substance of the district/school reform program, and in the skills needed by teachers and principals to implement it. Awareness training could include the essential elements of effective teaching, curricular change, and school effectiveness that are in the school/district/state program. Initial training could address general pedagogy, curriculum content, program purposes and goals, and program content. Skill training includes the processes and responsibilities of the cross-role teams and the principal, including instructional leadership, clinical supervision, needs assessment, and school improvement program developmental processes. For teachers, skill training would include curriculum content, general effective teaching, content- specific pedagogy, and classroom management. Training cycles could be scheduled sequentially, for example, with math training done one year, science training done the next, and so forth.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. What training is done to increase staff's awareness of the reforms?
2. How are the cross-role teams trained?
3. What training is done to increase staff's skills at implementing the new programs? Differentiate principals from teachers, and teachers by content area.
4. Is the training for different subject areas cycled sequentially, or do all areas receive training at the same time?
5. What messages on initial training are given for subsequent, follow-up training and assistance?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CHANGE, ALIGNMENT
(J)

Program transformation is the curriculum program as actually implemented, or as in the process of being implemented, in a school. We are interested in how the curriculum has changed since 1983, both across various content areas and within content areas. We are interested in the degree of alignment of curriculum objectives, texts and tests. We need to know the degree to which the new curriculum is better both content wise and in analytic skills, higher order thinking skills areas.

Schools may be phasing-in curriculum changes. We need to know the phase-in sequence, and rationale for it.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. Describe the new curriculum program as it looks now.
2. How are the services for special populations aligned with the core curriculum?
3. How did the program get to where it is currently?
4. Was there a conscious decision to make the program evolve, or was it done haphazardly?
5. What forms did the program take over time? In other words, describe the program as it evolved.

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT, PRESSURE, MONITORING
(K)

ONGOING COMMITMENT, either technical or symbolic, by line administrators and principals includes involvement in the program after adoption. Such involvement can simply reflect knowledge of the new practices being implemented and can include giving assistance to teachers who are working on mastering the practice. Knowledgeable administrators and principals often are developed during initial training. They are not experts in all areas, but the teachers see them as experts in curriculum planning and school improvement. They show commitment beyond initial training by not only sticking with the program, but insisting on its continuing implementation and are willing to commit resources to it. Their actions, rather than words, indicate how knowledgeable they are. One indicator of active commitment is whether administrators attend workshop training sessions, and support other activities - including allocating resources that are needed for complete implementation.

PRESSURE is exerted by line administrators. Because it takes energy and hard work to learn new practices and change curriculum and procedures, ongoing administrative pressure to "keep at it" is needed for full implementation. Pressure includes both a clear message that the program must be fully implemented and that all core elements of the program need to be implemental. To be effective, strong pressure to continue implementation works only if complemented by lots of assistance and help.

MONITORING is done by line administrators to ensure continuation of proper implementation. It may be to determine the concerns staff in the implementation process, the extent of implementation, or fidelity of the program's implementation. At this point, monitoring is conducted for the purpose of deciding what kind of assistance to provide, as opposed to monitoring for evaluation.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. How are line administrators supporting program facilitators?
2. Is administrative support technical or symbolic? Give examples.
3. What involvement do the administrators still have in program implementation?
4. How knowledgeable are the administrators about the program?
5. Do teachers perceive them as experts? If so, in what areas?
6. Do the administrators attend program workshops?
7. What types of monitoring do the administrators do to ensure program implementation?
8. How much do administrators insist on full program implementation?
9. Do teachers feel "pressure" to get the program in place fully?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

LATITUDE/FIDELITY
(L)

FIDELITY is how well the program as implemented reflects the program as developed. High fidelity occurs when the program has a few adaptations, modifications or transformations over time. **LATITUDE** is the degree to which administrators let others modify programs to fit local realities. Adaptation always takes place, but if latitude is too wide, effects are program blunting, or trivialization, and weak student impacts.

Program transformation is the way schools may alter innovations over time. It is a description of how the program actually looks midstream, rather than how it is supposed to look. It is also a description of the forms the program take over time, how much it changes, how diversified it becomes, how it comes to be the way it is. A strong centralized authority, along with strong influence on the part of the program's advocate, results in restricting program transformation. Administrative latitude, resulting from low commitment, pressure, and monitoring, allows for high program transformation.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. How much latitude did the district/school provide for program implementation?
2. Was there a press for fidelity?
3. What is the degree of adaptation to fit local needs?
4. What do you perceive were the results of having high (or low) latitude/fidelity?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

ONGOING ASSISTANCE
(M)

Assistance may be provided over time by both internal and external consultants, or linking agents. The type and amount of assistance varies over time, as well as who provides the assistance. Assistance is concrete, continuous, and gives clear direction from credible people. Assistance may be user-oriented, helping the user with problem-solving, or it may be in the form of the assister exerting pressure aimed at making the receiver do something.

External linking agents provide assistance at the *initiation* stage by:

- *helping with needs assessment
- *writing proposals
- *selecting programs

During the implementation stage they are:

- *stimulating community members to stay active
- *providing logistical support to ensure that meetings are scheduled regularly
- *training internal trainers
- *demonstrating
- *identifying resources
- *keeping the attention focused on the implementation

Their main role may be at the front end, helping teachers adopt project methods and materials to their own situations and solve their own problems. These agents often are viewed by school personnel as valuable in identifying needs, selecting solutions, and facilitating the implementation of a validated program. They often have continuous contact with school personnel, offering directly useful technical assistance at the "how to" level. It is critical that these agents are on-site and are used in combination with internal agents to support activities. The external consultant not only has some technical expertise, but also has knowledge about the process of organizational change, especially in relating to key district administrators and school personnel.

During the full implementation and institutionalization stages, the role of the external agent may decrease. The agent's main roles are to provide follow-up help as implementation progresses and to develop plans for continuation and institutionalization, for example, securing funds and developing new users at the school.

External agents are frequently program developers or people who have had extensive experience implementing the program. Governments are the major sources of external agents. Other sources include regional educational labs, research and development centers, and regional units in which several school districts ban together to provide services.

Internal linking agents include principals and central office staff.

Principals ensure that:

- *all instructional staff are aware that the new practice is a top priority
- *materials are available
- *teachers have ready access to other linking agents
- *teachers are given time to actually use the practice through help with classroom and schoolwide scheduling
- *the school climate is conducive to continuous, systematic problem-solving
- *teachers understand that all components of the program are to be implemented
- * teachers, parents, and central office staff are working in a realistic time frame and do not feel pressured by premature evaluations

Central office agents often are:

- *coaching teachers and principals
- *coordinating the use of the external linking agents
- *becoming familiar with the needs of students in individual schools,
- *familiar with the content, purpose, and benefits of the new program
- *arranging funding and other support from the district or other sources
- *assisting with evaluation
- *planning program institutionalization
- *working with external agents to arrange and conduct training
- *obtaining endorsements for the new practice from the superintendent, school board, principals, and teachers

Aside from their individual functions, these three kinds of assisters need to fit together. Internal assisters are not replacing external assisters; rather, their efforts are complementing one another. Further, the types of assistance discussed above usually need to be provided, but different people can provide it. The above describes general role practices. Finally, assistance is continual throughout the implementation process, changing focus and intensity as the need arises.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. Describe the type of assistance provided over the course of reform implementation.
2. How has assistance changed over time?
3. Who provides it and who receives what types of assistance?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

TEACHER EFFORT
(N)

Teacher effort is the willingness of teachers to engage in the reform, both physically and psychologically. It is the time and energy expended to achieve practice mastery. Practice mastery, usually, in turn, leads to teacher commitment. Indicators of teacher effort include working on the program, practicing, learning more about it, becoming better at the skills rather than simply doing them, going to program meetings, and trying suggestions that come out of those meetings.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. How much effort are teachers putting forth to implement the new programs?
2. Describe the types of effort teachers are putting forth to learn the new programs, so they can implement them with ease?

116

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

SKILLS MASTERY
(P)

Skills mastery is the attainment of satisfactory levels of expertise in the new curriculum content or program practice. At this time, insecurities give way to securities, confidence, and a sense of being in control. This sense of efficacy is developed when users see themselves as effective on a daily basis, as successful in getting the results they were after. At skills mastery, users spend most of their time improving, debugging, refining, and integrating the program. They may also become more concerned about whether promised results will be achieved, lack of support from outside staff, or the priority of the project.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. Have the users yet developed skills mastery?
2. If so, how long did it take them?
3. How do you know that mastery has been achieved?
4. Are users doing anything else now that skills mastery has been achieved?

117

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

COMMITMENT
(Q)

Commitment is a psychological feeling of support for the program. It is something that is generally achieved through time, rather than existing before program implementation. It is the willingness of staff to support the program, to continue the program, to refine it and/or expand it to improve it even further.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. How much commitment does the district/school staff have to the continuation of the programr
2. Describe the actions of feelings of the staff that demonstrate their level of commitment.
3. Why are staff committed/not committed to the program?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
(R)

Extent of implementation is the percentage of use by an individual teacher, as well as by all the teachers in the school and all the schools within the district at any given point in time. It is also the extent of the curriculum reform, including the improvement of Teaching and improvement of instructional supervision.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. What is the percentage of use of the program at this school?
2. What is the average percentage of use of any given teacher?
3. What is the percentage of use of the program throughout the district?
4. How extensively are programs for special populations integrated with the core curriculum?
5. How extensively is the curriculum reform being implemented? What does it include other than the courses?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

MANDATING WIDE USE
(S)

Mandating wide use is a district-wide, an in-building phenomenon.. Mandating wide use should result in all the potential users actually implementing the innovation. For example, substantial or full use occurs when all or many teachers in the school and district who are eligible to use the innovation actually do so. There may be wide in-building use, but limited district use, or wide use in one but not all content areas. Many teachers within a school may be using the innovation, yet few schools throughout the district may be actually participating. Wide use may be ensured by maintaining some administrative pressure for implementation, providing assistance sufficient to enable user practice mastery and student impact, and supporting the development of user commitment.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. Has the district/school mandated wide use of the reform?
2. What has facilitated/limited wide use of the programs?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

STUDENT IMPACT
(T)

Student impact is the achievement of affective and behavorial changes in the students as a result of exposure to the reform programs. It is the outcomes the program have for the student. One type of outcome is *direct.*. For example, improved reading skills or better problem solving skills are a direct outcome of a directly contemplated objective. A second type of outcome is *metalevel.* It is an outcome congruent with the program's purposes, but affecting more general aspects of students' functioning. An example of a metalevel outcome of a reading program would be more self-direction on the part of students. Finally, *side effects* are a third outcome. Although they are not easily separable from metalevel effects, they usually have a more unintended flavor. This illustrates the fact that both positive and negative student impacts may be achieved.

Indicators of student impact include trends in:

Test scores
Drop-out rates
National Merit Finalists
Percentage of students qualifying for UC system
Attendance
Attitudes
Participation in school activities.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. In general, what student impacts have you seen resulting from the reform?
2. What are the direct impacts? Indirect? Side effects? Discuss both positive and negative.
3. Have the services for special populations alienated or integrated these students?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

ORGANIZATIONAL IMPACT
(U)

Organizational impact is the occurance of organizational changes beyond the innovation itself. Impact is visible at three levels: *structure*, which includes rearrangements of persons, roles and resources; *procedures*, methods of all sorts for carrying out the work of the schools, and *climate*, the attitudes, feelings and relationships among persons.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. How has the organization changed as a result of the program?
2. What difficulties or problems has the program posed for the organization?
3. How is the school climate/structure/procedures changed since before the program implementation?

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

ASSESSMENT EVALUATION
(V)

Data gathering is done to assess the effects of the reform for state and local purposes. The data may take several forms, from parent interviews to local program quality review processes and their documents. Assessment may be done to evaluate program outcomes, as well as to drive program implementation.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. How much data gathering has/is being done to assess the reform?
2. Who is doing it?
3. Describe the types of data gathering taking place.
4. How much does the data gathering drive program implementation? Explain.

5. IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE DESCRIPTORS

INSTITUTIONALIZATION
(W)

Institutionalization is the degree to which the program is incorporated into the ordinary structures and procedures of the school and its surrounding district. This does not mean sheer "continuation," but the presence of indicators that the reform program has become organizationally routine. It is the degree to which standard operating procedures have been changed to incorporate new things. It is the presence of organizational conditions that signal routinization of the reform to where it loses its special identity.

KEY QUESTIONS:

1. Do you feel the reform programs have become institutionalized in your school? District?
2. If so, what organizational changes have occurred to indicate such institutionalization?

ROUND TWO CASE STUDY OUTLINE

Overview. The purpose of the second round is to examine implementation using the "dead bug" chart causal factors as an explicit guide. Your causal factors issue sheets will describe your site in terms of what each individual factors looks like in detail. The Round Two case study will describe how the factors fit together, and why these factors seem to fit together this way. This analysis of the bundle of factors at each site needs to include:

1. The story of how the factors fit together.

2. A rationale for the "dead bug" chart you have drawn for each site.

Case Study Outline. Please describe the relationship of the factors in terms of:

1. The relationship of the vision to the implementation strategy.

   How did the nature of the vision at the district and school influence the approach taken to implementation?

2. The nature of the complete implementation stage.

   What are key aspects of plans/planning/ strategies/activities in the implementation stage?

   What are the roles of teachers, site administrators, central office staff and outside consultants in the complete implementation stage?

   How and why do implementation strategies change over time?

   In what sense is implementation "top-down" "bottom-up" or both? What is the time sequence of this pattern?

3. The relationship of pressure, latitude, and assistance.

   What is the relationship of pressure, latitude and assistance during implementation?

   How do pressure, latitude, and assistance relate to organizational levels: school, district, and state?

4. The program as envisioned and as reality at the school and in the classroom.

   What is the degree of fidelity or mutual adaption of all or parts of the reform as related to the state vision and the district vision?

Was the reform downsized or blunted as implemented at the school or in the classroom?

5. How the causal factors fit together (2 page limit)

In summary, how do the various causal factors from the dead bug chart fit together?

Why do you think they fit together this way?

What local mediating variables have influenced the way the factors fit together?

Dead Bug Chart Rationale. Please add any comments needed to clarify what your dead bug chart means beyond what is said in your causal factor summary (number 5 above).

Appendix C

Outcomes Research Instruments

OUTCOMES COVER SHEET

SCHOOL:____________________________________

DATA COLLECTOR(S):__________________________

Directions: Outcomes need to be rated by comparing the situation in the school in 1982 with the situation at the school at the present time. For each of the administrator, school climate, teacher and student items on the following pages, you as the expert data collector for the school are being asked to make 3 ratings:

1. Where the school is now.
2. Where the school was in 1982, ie, just before SB813 was passed.
3. What the contribution of SB 813 was to any change between 1982 and the present.

The ratings are to be your assessment of each item. You may want or need to collect more data to make them, but the emphasis is not so much on more data collection as on your summary judgment about the item with supporting comments.

Notice that the primary emphasis is a comparison by the same rater(s) of the same school at two different points in time. The critical issue is the difference between 1982 and the present for that item and at that school.

All 3 ratings are being treated as continuous variables, so please make a mark anywhere along the continuum. Please mark your judgment as to where the school stands relative to all public schools you know-- 100 represents the very best school you know, 0 the very worst-- for each item. If you can't rate an item for any reason, indicate the reason on the page.

The contribution of SB 813 per se should be rated only if there is a difference between 1982 and the present.

In the supporting comments section, provide comments about the difference between 1982 and the present that led you to make the rating you did. For all the ratings, please provide examples or comments that support the rating you have given. We need hard evidence cited in the supporting comments section, especially for student outcomes.

OUTCOMES CONCERNING ONGOING SCHOOL CLIMATE

1. The ability of the school to establish a shared school vision, set, of norms and/or set of goals.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

2. The extent of collegiality and mutual trust between administrators and teachers, and between teachers and teachers.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE

Strong Negative Influence / Neutral Influence / Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

3. The extent that the school staff talk about teaching and learning, observe each other teach, and work together on curriculum, teaching or school change.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

OUTCOMES FOR ONGOING ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE

1. The ability of district administrators to carry out school planning and vision setting.

RATING:

NOW
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE

Strong Negative Influence — Neutral Influence — Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

2. The ability of site administrators to carry out school planning and vision setting.

3. The ability of site administrators to initiate and manage a change process

RATING:

NOW	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1982	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

4. The extent to which the school reflects a norm of continuously working on school improvement.

RATING:

NOW
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE

Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

4. The ability of site administrators to manage ongoing curriculum and instructional activities at the school.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE

Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

5. The ability of site administrators to provide clinical supervision to teachers.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

6. The interest of the site administrators in initiating and sustaining new waves of reform at the school.

RATING:

NOW
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

IMPACT ON TEACHERS

1. The extent of teachers' content knowledge.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

2. The extent of teachers' traditional classroom pedagogical skills including classroom management.

RATING:

NOW	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1982	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

3. The extent of teachers' instructional skills in higher order thinking, cooperative learning and other innovative instructional skills.

RATING:

NOW	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1982	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

4. Teachers' sense of efficacy (the feeling that they can successfully help students to learn more) and teachers' sense of professionalism (identify how teachers define this sense), and commitment to teaching and the profession including willingness to work hard.

RATING:

NOW	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
1982	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

STUDENT OUTCOMES

1. The way the school is treating its students as indicated by the level of safety afforded them, the amount of respect they are given, ant the extent of services and activities provided them.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE

Strong Negative Influence — Neutral Influence — Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

2. The extent of student achievement as measured by standardized tests such as CTBS and CAP, and student recognition for academic accomplishments.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

3. The extent of student drop-outs.

RATING:

NOW
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982
0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE

Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

4. The extent of student accomplishment on local proficiency exams and other indicators of basic skill.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE	Strong Negative Influence	Neutral Influence	Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

5. The extent of students obtaining low grades on academic subjects such as math and English.

RATING:

NOW 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

1982 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

CONTRIBUTION OF SB 813 PER SE

Strong Negative Influence | Neutral Influence | Strong Positive Influence

Supporting Comments:

Appendix D

Special Populations Research Instruments

148

SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS AND EDUCATION REFORM

Round 2 Data Collection

We need a separate report on how special student populations are affected by or affect the reform program at each school. This is a critical issue for at least two reasons. First, many people feel that education reform will function to the disadvantage of special needs students. Others argue that education reform, by strengthening a core curriculum that all students are expected to master, will in fact upgrade services provided to special needs students.

For our study, special populations include the following four groups:

1. students in Chapter I or state (EIA/SCE) compensatory education programs
2. limited-English proficient and/or students in bilingual education programs
3. students needing remedial help and/or in a school's "remedial" track
4. potential drop-outs, or "at-risk" students, however defined by the school.

We are not concerned with special education students.

Your special populations report should include responses to the following 7 general questions. First, briefly describe the different tracks (if present) in your school, such as college bound, general, remedial, bilingual. If some classes have tracks(such as reading and mathematics) and some do not (such as social studies), please specify.

1. Please describe the schools's conception of services for the four groups of students. For limited-English proficient students, please discuss rationale for,nature and degree of instruction in native language. Also, if appropriate, describe how the existence of such students affected how the school defined its conception of education reform.

2. Please describe (1 page, single spaced) for each category of student the school's program for that group of students. Give the number of students in the program and how selected. State whether teacher aides or professional education staff provide services, or what the mix is. Specifically describe how the extra services are provided, i.e., who gives them, where/when they are given, etc. Describe a typical day or week schedule for a compensatory or limited-English proficient student.

3. Please describe the curriculum program for each program for special needs students. We want to know specifically whether the curriculum program for special needs students is the same as or different from that for regular students. If the same, we need to know how services/curriculum are aligned with the regular programs.

4. Please describe how the program has changed during the past four years, or since the implementation of the school's reform program.

5. Please describe how special needs students are performing today versus 1983 or the onset of the school's reform efforts. Are they doing, better, worse, the same? Get as much specific data as possible.

6. What is the school's drop-out rate and level of enrollment in continuation schools? Changes in these numbers since 1983 or the onset of the school's reform efforts?

7. Please give your overall assessment of how special students have been treated by or affected the definition of education reform in your school.

Appendix E

Outcomes

TABLE E1 - CAP RESULTS

	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	11	12	14	15	16	17
1	CAP RESULTS													
2			BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS			MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS		
3		(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)				(ADA: 36,395 - 30,850)			(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)			(ADA: 18,341 - 182)		
4		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	
5	READING													
6	PERCENT CORRECT													
7	1983 84	67.3	51.3	65.4	58.1	64.7	57.7	47.4	58.2	64.1	65.4	62.4	62.4	
8	1984 85	67.8	51.2	68.3	60.2	66.4	57.7	48.9	62.9	64.4	63.1	63.6	64.2	
9	1985 86	66.8	49.9	64	61.8	69.1	62.6	51.1	61.3	65.6	57.6	63.3	66	
10	1986 87	67.7	53	66.3	61.4	68.7	64.7	52.4	64.3	65.3	65.5	62.8	62.4	
11	PERCENT ABOVE Q3													
12	1983-84	33	12	28	19	28	21	11	18	27	25	24	22	
13	1984-85	34	14	33	23	30	21	14	26	27	25	28	27	
14	1985 86	32	13	26	25	35	26	13	22	29	19	27	26	
15	1986-87	34	18	30	24	36	28	18	29	29	31	28	27	
16	PERCENT ABOVE Q2													
17	1983 84	59	32	57	44	53	45	27	43	45	52	49	60	
18	1984 85	61	31	62	47	58	43	28	52	54	51	53	63	
19	1985 86	59	25	53	50	63	61	31	48	56	42	53	66	
20	1986 87	61	36	58	49	63	55	34	55	56	57	53	62	
21	PERCENT ABOVE Q1													
22	1983 84	82	59	80	71	79	71	51	70	76	84	76	50	
23	1984 85	84	60	86	72	84	69	56	80	80	77	80	53	
24	1985 86	82	56	78	76	87	75	54	76	82	89	79	56	
25	1986 87	85	64	84	77	88	81	63	83	83	82	79	52	
26														
27	MATHEMATICS													
28	PERCENT CORRECT													
29	1983 84	73.1	57.9	69.7	61.3	70.6	66.2	54.3	68.6	66.4	71.8	63.2	65.5	
30	1984 85	74.3	53.9	74.2	62.8	75.7	66.6	55.6	70.4	66.6	67.2	65.1	61.2	
31	1985-86	75	55.8	71.7	66	75.6	70	56.7	70.6	68.9	68.1	68.3	68.5	
32	1986 87	74.8	60.4	74.4	64.7	74.2	72.5	54.7	72.3	69.9	69.3	70.2	65.3	
33	PERCENT ABOVE Q3													
34	1983 84	37	14	26	19	29	22	9	26	24	33	18	20	
35	1984 85	40	12	37	20	41	24	13	28	25	24	25	12	
36	1985 86	41	13	32	25	41	28	13	31	28	28	26	34	
37	1986-87	40	19	38	23	39	34	13	33	29	30	30	21	
38	PERCENT ABOVE Q2													
39	1983 34	58	28	52	35	51	43	23	48	46	52	37	43	
40	1984-85	61	23	59	37	63	43	26	50	44	44	41	30	
41	1985 86	62	25	53	42	63	50	26	51	48	49	47	50	
42	1986 87	62	33	60	39	60	55	23	54	49	49	50	39	
43	PERCENT ABOVE Q1													
44	1983 84	83	59	80	65	83	73	51	78	74	83	67	71	
45	1984 85	86	51	89	68	90	75	52	84	75	78	73	68	
46	1985 86	86	55	85	75	88	82	56	84	79	76	78	77	
47	1966 87	89	65	91	75	89	89	54	89	84	82	84	77	
48														
49	DIFFERENCE 1983 - 1987													
50	TOTAL READING	0.4	1.7	0.9	3.3	4	7	5	6.1	1.2	0.1	0.4	0	
51	% ABOVE Q3	1	6	2	5	8	7	7	11	2	6	4		
52	% ABOVE Q2	2	4	1	5	10	10	7	12	1	5	4	2	
53	% ABOVE Q1	3	5	4	6	9	10	12	13	7	-2	3	3	
54	TOTAL MATHEMATICS	1.7	2.5	4.7	3.4	3.6	6.3	0.4	3.7	3.5	-2.5	7	-0.2	
55	% ABOVE Q3	3	5	12	4	10	12	4	7	5	-3	12	1	
56	% ABOVE Q 2	4	5	8	4	9	12	0	6	3	-3	13	-4	
57	% ABOVE Q1	6	6	11	10	6	8	16	11	10	-1	17	6	
58														
59														
60														
61														
62														
63														
64														
65	151												152	

TABLE E2 - SCHOOL CLIMATE SUMMARY

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	SCHOOL CLIMATE OUTCOMES COMPARISONS													
2						AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE					
3		AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	LARGE	LARGE	MEDIUM	RURAL					
4		TOTAL	TOTAL	BIG CITY	BIG CITY	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT					
5		HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL					
6	SCHOOL CLIMATE OUTCOMES													
7	1. Shared Sense of Vision													
8	NOW	75	68	85	85	77	85	70	75					
9	1982	44	52	66	66	23	60	55	47					
10	DIFFERENCE	30	16	19	19	54	25	15	28					
11	SB 813 Contribution	3.84	3.90	4.17	4.17	4.13	3.50	3.75	3.82					
12	2. Collegiality & Mutual Trust													
13	NOW	76	61	75	76	68	80	70	93					
14	1982	46	47	59	59	23	60	58	50					
15	DIFFERENCE	30	14	17	17	45	20	13	43					
16	SB 813 Contribution	3.19	3.68	4.10	4.10	3.13	3.00	3.75	3.35					
17	3. Tchr Talking Teaching/Learning													
18	NOW	72	72	75	75	66	68	73	83					
19	1982	40	59	62	62	23	55	53	40					
20	DIFFERENCE	32	13	13	13	43	13	20	43					
21	SB 813 Contribution	3.98	3.72	4.20	4.20	3.65	3.00	3.50	4.23					
22	4. Sch w/School Improvement													
23	NOW	77	64	84	84	81	70	75	75					
24	1982	51	50	66	66	37	50	58	47					
25	DIFFERENCE	27	15	18	18	44	20	18	28					
26	SB 813 Contribution	4.27	4.20	4.33	4.33	4.30	4.00	4.00	4.60					
27														
28	SCHOOL OUTCOMES SUMMARY													
29	(1-3 ONLY - HIGH SCHOOLS)													
30	NOW	74		78		70		71	84					
31	1982	44		62		23		55	46					
32	DIFFERENCE	31		16		47		16	38					
33	SB 813 Contribution	3.87		4.16		3.83		3.67	3.80					
34														
35	SCHOOL OUTCOMES SUMMARY													
36	(1,2,4 ONLY - JHS/MS)													
37	NOW		65		81		78							
38	1982		49		64		57							
39	DIFFERENCE		16		18		22							
40	SB 813 Contribution		3.92		4.20		3.50							
41														
42	SCHOOL OUTCOMES SUMMARY													
43	(1-5)													
44	NOW	75	66	80	80	73	78	72	81					
45	1982	45	52	63	53	26	58	56	46					
46	DIFFERENCE	30	15	17	17	47	19	16	36					
47	SB 813 CONTRIBUTION	3.82	3.87	4.20	4.20	3.80	3.38	3.75	4.00					
48														
49														
50														
51														
52														
53														
54														
55														
56														
57														
58														
59														
60														
61														
62														
63														
64														
65														

TABLE E3 - ADMINISTRATIVE OUTCOMES SUMMARY

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES COMPARISONS													
2						AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE					
3		AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	LARGE	LARGE	MEDIUM	RURAL					
4		TOTAL	TOTAL	BIG CITY	BIG CITY	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT					
5		HIGHSCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGHSCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGHSCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGHSCHOOL	HIGHSCHOOL					
6														
7	I. ADM PRACTICE													
8	1. DistAdm w/Sch Vision													
9	NOW	75	85	81	82	76	90	60	78					
10	1982	43	61	58	62	27	60	45	43					
11	DIFFERENCE	32	24	23	20	49	30	15	35					
12	SB 813 Contribution	4.30	4.44	4.33		4.87	4.50	3.50	4.23					
13	2. Site Adm w/Sch Vision													
14	NOW	73	69	70	68	77	70	75	71					
15	1982	48	54	54	46	33	65	63	46					
16	DIFFERENCE	25	15	16	22	43	5	13	25					
17	SB 813 Contribution	4.08	3.74	4.00	3.90	4.57	3.50	3.75	3.90					
18	3. Site Adm Manage Change													
19	NOW	73	62	71	60	73	65	70	79					
20	1982	44	50	59	40	24	65	60	39					
21	DIFFERENCE	29	12	11	20	48	0	10	40					
22	SB 813 Contribution	4.26	3.70	3.90	3.50	4.83	4.00	3.00	4.90					
23	4 Site Adm Manage Curr/Inst.													
24	NOW	64	63	55	58	63	70	59	78					
25	1982	44	51	46	36	41	73	55	37					
26	DIFFERENCE	21	12	9	22	22	-3	4	41					
27	SB 813 Contribution	4.10	3.30	4.17	3.50	4.13	3.00	3.25	4.57					
28	5. Site Adm w/Clinical Super.													
29	NOW	68	54	60	47	65	65	70	78					
30	1982	45	49	37	32	54	75	55	33					
31	DIFFERENCE	23	5	23	15	11	-10	15	45					
32	SB 813 Contribution	4.29	2.74	4.60	3.35	3.83	3.60	3.45	5.17					
33	6. Site Adm w/Reform Waves													
34	NOW	76	64	67	67	83	60	75	78					
35	1982	46	59	53	61	26	55	60	58					
36	DIFFERENCE	30	5	14	6	57	5	15	20					
37	SB 813 Contribution	4.47	4.14	4.17	4.23	4.75	4.00	4.50	4.37					
38														
39	ADMIN PRACTICES SUMMARY													
40	NOW	72	66	67	64	73	70	68	77					
41	1982	45	54	51	48	34	65	56	43					
42	DIFFERENCE	27	12	16	14	39	5	12	34					
43	SB 813 CONTRIBUTION	4.25	3.68	4.19	3.08	4.49	3.75	3.58	4.52					
44														
45														
46														
47														
48														
49														
50														
51														
52														
53														
54														
55														
56														
57														
58														
59														
60														
61														
62														
63														
64														
65														

TABLE E4 - OUTCOMES FOR TEACHERS SUMMARY

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	OUTCOMES FOR TEACHERS					AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE						
2		AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	LARGE	LARGE	MEDIUM	RURAL						
3		TOTAL	TOTAL	BIG CITY	BIG CITY	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT						
4		HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL						
5															
6	OUTCOMES FOR TEACHERS														
7	1. Extent of Content Knowledge														
8	NOW	67	68	72	91	52	70	75	72						
9	1982	53	60	67	80	33	60	69	49						
10	DIFFERENCE	14	8	8	16	19	10	6	23						
11	SB 813 Contribution	3.85	2.88	3.47	4.13	3.95	3.00	3.75	4.17						
12	2. Tchr Trad Pedagogical Skills														
13	NOW	61	49	78	78	40	90	85	60						
14	1982	45	34	64	64	28	40	60	52						
15	DIFFERENCE	16	15	14	14	13	50	26	8						
16	SB 813 Contribution	3.91	2.90	3.83	3.83	3.70	3.00	3.25	4.67						
17	3. Tchr Inst Skills/Higher Order														
18	NOW	55	55	82	82	53	30	50	58						
19	1982	41	40	63	63	43	10	45	40						
20	DIFFERENCE	14	16	19	10	10	20	5	18						
21	SB 813 Contribution	3.78	3.20	4.33	4.33	3.25	3.00	4.00	4.57						
22	4. Tchr Sense of Efficacy														
23	NOW	77	76	83	83	75	65	80	80						
24	1982	54	53	72	72	48	50	58	43						
25	DIFFERENCE	24	23	11	11	28	40	23	38						
26	SB 813 Contribution	3.98	4.02	4.03	4.03	4.20	4.00	3.75	4.22						
27															
28	OUTCOMES FOR TEACHERS SUMMARY														
29	(1-3 ONLY - HIGH SCHOOLS)														
30	NOW	61		77		49		70	63						
31	1982	46		64		35		58	47						
32	DIFFERENCE	15		13		14		12	17						
33	SB 813 Contribution	3.85		3.88		3.63		3.67	4.47						
34															
35	OUTCOMES FOR TEACHERS SUMMARY														
36	(1,2,4 ONLY - JHS/MS)														
37	NOW		64		84		75								
38	1982		49		72		50								
39	DIFFERENCE		15		14		33								
40	SB 813 Contribution		3.53		4.00		3.33								
41															
42	OUTCOMES FOR TEACHERS SUMMARY														
43	(1-5)														
44	NOW	65	62	79	83	55	64	73	68						
45	1982	48	47	66	70	38	40	58	46						
46	DIFFERENCE	17	16	12	15	17	30	16	22						
47	SB 813 CONTRIBUTIONS	3.88	3.45	3.92	4.08	3.78	3.25	3.69	4.40						
48															
49															
50															
51															
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

TABLE E5 - STUDENT OUTCOMES SUMMARY

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	STUDENT OUTCOMES COMPARISONS					AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE						
2		AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	LARGE	LARGE	MEDIUM	RURAL						
3		TOTAL	TOTAL	BIG CITY	BIG CITY	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT						
4		HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	JHS/MS	HIGH SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL						
5															
6	STUDENT OUTCOMES														
7	1. Treatment of Students														
8	NOW	81	52	85	85	79	90	83	76						
9	1982	53	44	76	76	34	70	53	49						
10	DIFFERENCE	28	7	9	9	45	20	30	27						
11	SB 813 Contribution	3.84	3.78	3.97	3.97	3.65	3.50	4.50	4.27						
12	2. Achievement on Std Tests														
13	NOW	68	75	92	92	64	50	70	73						
14	1982	54	74	86	86	40	55	60	45						
15	DIFFERENCE	14	2	6	6	24	-5	10	28						
16	SB 813 Contribution	4.40	3.83	4.05	4.05	4.77	3.50	3.50	5.00						
17	3. Student Drop-outs														
18	NOW	45		88		15		19	82						
19	1982	35		86		10		18	55						
20	DIFFERENCE	10		2		5		1	27						
21	SB 813 Contribution	3.71		4.60		2.50		4.50	4.00						
22	4. Local Proficiency Tests														
23	NOW	79	80	94	94	65	59	80	84						
24	1982	61	78	91	91	40	58	70	58						
25	DIFFERENCE	19	2	2	2	25	2	10	26						
26	SB 813 Contribution	4.14	3.78	3.93	3.93	4.25	3.50	4.00	4.25						
27	5. Low Acad. Grades-Math/English														
28	NOW	50		40				30	54						
29	1982	51		41				48	48						
30	DIFFERENCE	-1		-1				-18	6						
31	SB 813 Contribution	3.13		3.75				3.25	3.17						
32															
33	STUDENT OUTCOMES - HS														
34	(1-3 ONLY)														
35	NOW	65		88		52		57	76						
36	1982	47		83		28		44	49						
37	DIFFERENCE	18		6		25		14	27						
38	SB 813 CONTRIBUTION	3.98		4.21		3.84		4.17	4.42						
39															
40	STUDENT OUTCOMES - JHS/MS														
41	(1,2,4 ONLY)														
42	NOW		69		90		66								
43	1982		65		84		61								
44	DIFFERENCE		4		6		6								
45	SB 813 CONTRIBUTION		3.79		3.98		3.5								
46															
47	STUDENT OUTCOMES SUMMARY														
48	(1-5)														
49	NOW	65	41	80	54	44	40	58	73						
50	1982	30	39	76	51	25	37	50	51						
51	DIFFERENCE	14	2	4	3	20	3	7	22						
52	SB 813 CONTRIBUTION	3.84	2.27	4.06	2.39	3.03	2.10	3.95	4.14						
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

Appendix F

Senate Bill 813 Policies

TABLE F1 - STATE POLICY: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS IN YEARS

	1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16	17
1																		
2																		
3				BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS		
4			(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)					(ADA 36,393 - 30,850)				(ADA 15,132 - 14,091)				(ADA 18,341 - 182)		
5			Capital City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	AVERAGES
6																		
7	813 REQUIREMENTS																	
8																		
9	ENGLISH	3	4	4	4		4	4	3	4		4	4		3	3	4	3 7
10	MATH	2	2	2	3		2	2	2	2		3	2		2	2	3	2 3
11	SCIENCE	2	2	2	2		2	2	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	2
12	PHYSICAL	1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1		No requirements			1
13	LIFE	1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1		No requirements			1
14	SOCIAL STUDIES	3	3	3	3		4	3	3	3 5		3	3 5		3	2	3	3 2
15	WORLD CIVILIZATION	1	1	1				1				0 5	1					0 9
16	U S HISTORY	1	1	1				1	1			0 5	1		1			0 8
17	FOREIGN LANGUAGE OR FINE ARTS	1	1	1	1 5		1	1		1		1	1		1	1	1	1
18	PHYSICAL EDUCATION	2	2	2	2		2	3	2	2		2	2		2	2 5	3	2 15
19	AMERICAN GOVERNMENT	1	1	1				0 5				0 5	0 5		0 5			0 6
20	TOTAL UNITS			22			23			22 5			24					
21																		
22	STATE BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS																	
23	ENGLISH	4	4	4	4		4	4	3	4		4	4		3	3	4	
24	MATH	3	2	2	3		2	2	2	2		3	2		2	2	3	
25	SCIENCE	2	2	2	2		2	2	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
26	PHYSICAL	1	1	1			1	1				1	1		No requirements			
27	LIFE	1	1	1			1	1				1	1		No requirements			
28	SOCIAL STUDIES	3	3	3	3		4	3	3	3 5		3	3 5		3	3	3	
29	WORLD CIVILIZATION	1	1	1				1				0 5	1				1	
30	U S HISTORY	1	1	1				1				0 5	1			1		
31	FOREIGN LANGUAGE - 2 YRS		1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1		* 1	1		
32	FINE ARTS - 1 YR														*			
33	COMPUTERS - 1 SEMESTER			0			0											
34	ECONOMICS - 1 SEMESTER		0 5	0 5			0 5	0 5				0 5	0 5		0 5		0 5	
35	ETHICS - 1 SEMESTER																0 5	
36	TOTAL UNITS			22			23		21	22 5			24					
37																		
38	DATE OF CHANGE		1983				1983		1983	1983		1983	PRE 1983		1983	1983	1983	
39																		
40																		
41																		
42																		
43																		
44																		
45	[illegible] DATA																	
46																		
47																		
48																		
49																		
50																		
51																		
52																		
53																		
54																		
55																		
56																		
57																		
58																		
59																		
60																		
61																		
62																		
63																		
64																		
65																		

* Either 1 year Foreign Lang or 1 year Fine Arts

TABLE F2 A - STATE POLICY: MODEL CURRICULUM STANDARDS - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3																
4			BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
5			(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)			(ADA: 38,393 - 30,850)					(ADA: 15,132 - 14091)				(ADA: 18,341 - 182)	
6		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
7	COMPARED DISTRICT CURRICULUM TO MCS		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	SOME		SOME	YES		NO	YES	YES
8																
9	MODEL STANDARDS IN DISTRICT GUIDES															
10	MATH		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	NO		NO	YES		NA	YES	YES
11	SCIENCE		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES			NO	YES		NA	YES	YES
12	FOREIGN LANGUAGE		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES			YES	YES		NA	YES	YES
13	ENGLISH		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		NA	YES	YES
14	FINE ARTS		YES	YES		NO	YES	YES				YES		NA	NO	
15	SOCIAL STUDIES		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES			YES	YES		NA	YES	YES
16																
17	IMPACT OF CHANGE INCLUDED:															
18	EMPHASIS ON HIGHER THINKING SKILLS		YES	YES		YES		YES			YES	YES		NA		YES
19	EMPHASIS ON WRITING ACROSS CURRICULUM			YES		YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		NA	YES	YES
20	EMPHASIS ON READING ACROSS CURRICULUM			YES		YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		NA	YES	YES
21																
22	IMPACT ON COURSE CONTENT IN CLASSROOM															
23	MATH		LOW			NONE	LOW	MEDIUM			LOW	NONE		NA	HIGH	NONE
24	SCIENCE		LOW			LOW	LOW	MEDIUM			LOW			NA	MEDIUM	NONE
25	FOREIGN LANGUAGE		LOW			HIGH	LOW	LOW			LOW			NA	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
26	ENGLISH		LOW			MEDIUM	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		MEDIUM	MEDIUM		NA	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
27	FINE ARTS		LOW			NONE	LOW	NONE			NONE			NA	NA	
28	SOCIAL STUDIES		LOW			LOW	LOW	MEDIUM			MEDIUM			NA	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
29																
30																
31																
32																
33																
34																
35																
36																
37																
38																
39																
40																
41																
42																
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48	BLANK - INCOMPLETE DATA															
49	NA - NOT APPLICABLE															
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE F2B - STATE POLICY: MODEL CURRICULUM STANDARDS - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2															
3			BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
4		(ADA: 648,500 - 44,014)				(ADA: 36,393-15,132)									
5		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
6															
7	COMPARED DISTRICT CURRICULUM TO MCS	SOME	SOME	SOME			SOME								
8															
9	MODEL STANDARDS IN DISTRICT GUIDES														
10	MATH			YES			NO								
11	SCIENCE	YES		YES			YES								
12	FOREIGN LANGUAGE			YES			NO								
13	ENGLISH	YES		YES			YES								
14	FINE ARTS			YES			NO								
15	SOCIAL STUDIES	YES		YES			YES								
16															
17	IMPACT OF CHANGE INCLUDED														
18	EMPHASIS ON HIGHER ORDER THINKING	YES	YES				YES								
19	EMPHASIS ON WRITING ACROSS CURRICULUM	YES	YES	YES			YES								
20	EMPHASIS ON READING ACROSS CURRICULUM	YES	YES				YES								
21															
22	IMPACT ON COURSE CONTENT IN CLASSROOM														
23	MATH			MEDIUM											
24	SCIENCE			MEDIUM			MEDIUM								
25	FOREIGN LANGUAGE			MEDIUM											
26	ENGLISH	HIGH		MEDIUM			MEDIUM								
27	FINE ARTS			NONE											
28	SOCIAL STUDIES			NONE			MEDIUM								
29															
30															
31															
32															
33															
34															
35															
36															
37															
38															
39															
40															
41															
42															
43															
44															
45															
46															
47															
48															
49															
50															
51	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA														
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

TABLE F3 A - STATE POLICY: TEXT SELECTION - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
4			(ADA: 646,500-44,014)			(ADA: 36,393-30,850)					(ADA: 15,132-14,081)				(ADA: 18,341-182)	
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
6																
7																
8	SELECTION PROCESS															
9	WRITE CURRICULUM, THEN SELECT TEXTS		YES			YES	YES	YES			YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
10	SELECT TEXTS, THEN WRITE CURRICULUM			YES		NO		YES								
11	EITHER WAY BY DEPARTMENT	YES				NO										
12																
13	SELECTED BY:															
14	CURRICULUM COMM./CROSS ROLE TEAM					YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
15	DEPT. CHAIRS SELECT FROM DISTRICT LIST	YES	YES			NO		YES			YES				YES	
16	TEACHERS SELECT FROM DISTRICT LIST					YES	YES	YES								
17	TEACHERS SELECT AND SUBMIT TO DISTRICT	YES				YES					YES					
18	DISTRICT SELECTS ALL			YES		NO		NO								
19																
20	ALIGNMENT OF TEXTS WITH:															
21	CURRICULUM	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	
22	MODEL CURRICULUM STANDARDS	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	
23	TESTS	POOR				GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	
24																
25	ARE TEXTS BETTER DUE TO MODEL STANDARDS					YES		YES			YES				YES	
26																
27	ARE TEACHERS USING THE NEW TEXTS					YES		YES			YES				YES	
28																
34																
35																
36																
37																
38																
39																
40																
41																
42																
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA															
49																
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE F3B - STATE POLICY: TEXT SELECTION - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2															
3			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
4			(ADA 646,500 44,014)			(ADA: 36,393-15,132)									
5		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
6															
7															
8	SELECTION PROCESS:														
9	WRITE CURRICULUM, THEN SELECT TEXTS	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES								
10	SELECT TEXTS, THEN WRITE CURRICULUM														
11															
12	HOW SELECTED														
13	CURRICULUM COMM./CROSS ROLE TEAM	YES		YES		YES	YES								
14	DEPT. CHAIRS SELECT FROM DISTRICT LIST		YES	YES		YES									
15	TEACHERS SELECT FROM DISTRICT LIST			NO											
16	TEACHERS SELECT AND SUBMIT TO DISTRICT			YES			YES								
17	DISTRICT SELECTS ALL			YES											
18															
19	ALIGNMENT OF TEXTS WITH:														
20	CURRICULUM	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD								
21	MODEL CURRICULUM STANDARDS	GOOD	GOOD			GOOD	GOOD								
22	TESTS	GOOD	GOOD				GOOD								
23															
24	TEXTS ARE BETTER DUE TO MODEL STANDARDS						YES								
25															
26	TEACHERS ARE USING NEW TEXTS			YES			YES								
27															
28															
29															
30															
31															
32															
33															
34															
35															
36															
37															
38															
39															
40															
41															
42															
43															
44															
45															
46															
47															
48															
49															
50															
51															
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA														
62															
63															
64															
65															

TABLE F4 A · STATE POLICY: CAP TESTS · HIGH SCHOOLS

1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	11	12	14	15	16
		BIG CITY DISTRICTS (ADA: 646,500-44,014)		LARGE DISTRICTS (ADA: 38,393-30,850)				MEDIUM DISTRICTS (ADA: 15,132-14,091)			RURAL DISTRICTS (ADA: 18,341-182)	
	Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
DEGREE TO WHICH SITE IS AWARE OF NEW CAP		HIGH	HIGH	MEDIUM	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MEDIUM		HIGH	HIGH	
CAP INFLUENCE ON SCHOOL VISION	NO	HIGH	NO	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH
CAP DROVE CHANGE IN FOLLOWING AREAS:												
PRESSURE TO IMPROVE SCORES		YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
INCREASED FOCUS ON BASICS		YES	YES	NO		YES		YES		LIMITED	YES	
INCREASED EMPHASIS ON WRITING				NO		YES				YES	YES	
INCREASED EMPHASIS ON HIGHER THINKING				YES		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES
INCREASED EMPHASIS ON SCIENCE				NO	YES	YES				NO	YES	
INCREASED EMPHASIS ON SOCIAL STUDIES				NO								
IS TESTING REVIEW PROVIDED?		YES		NO	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
INFLUENCE OF CASH FOR CAPS	NO			LOW	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	
CAP SCORES UP 1983-1987				YES		YES	YES	YES		...		
READING	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MATHEMATICS	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO

BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA

TABLE F4B - STATE POLICY, CAP TESTS - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3		BIG CITY DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS	
4			(ADA: 646,500)			(ADA: 36,393 - 15,132)	
5		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS
8	DEGREE TO WHICH SITE AWARE OF NEW CAP	HIGH		HIGH		LOW	HIGH
10	DEGREE TO WHICH CAP INFLUENCED REFORM	HIGH	MEDIUM	MEDIUM		HIGH	MEDIUM
12	CAP DROVE CHANGE IN FOLLOWING AREAS:						
13	PRESSURE TO IMPROVE SCORES		YES	YES			YES
14	INCREASED FOCUS ON BASICS			NO			
15	INCREASED EMPHASIS ON WRITING	YES	YES	YES			YES
16	INCREASED EMPHASIS ON HIGHER THINKING			YES			YES
17	INCREASED EMPHASIS ON SCIENCE			YES			YES
18	INCREASED EMPHASIS ON SOCIAL STUDIES			NO			YES
20	IS TESTING REVIEW PROVIDED?					YES	YES
22	INFLUENCE OF CASH FOR CAPS						
24	CAP SCORES UP 1983-1986						
25	READING:	YES	YES	YES		NO	YES
26	MATHEMATICS:	YES	YES	YES		NO	YES
47	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA						

TABLE F5A - STATE POLICY: MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
4			(ADA: 646,500-44,014)			(ADA: 36,393-30,850))					(ADA: 15,132-14,091)				(ADA: 18,341-182)	
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
6																
7	DISTRICT HAS MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		NO	YES		YES	YES	YES
8																
9	SCHOOL HAS MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM					YES		NO	YES		NO			YES	NO	
10																
11	SELECTION PROCESS CRITERIA															
12	APPLICATION					YES	YES	YES	YES		NA	YES		YES	YES	YES
13	INTERVIEW	YES	YES			YES		YES						YES	YES	
14	OBSERVATION	YES	YES			YES		YES						YES	YES	
15	PROVEN EFFECTIVENESS IN DEALING W/OTHERS					NO								DK	YES	
16	NOMINATION					NO								NO		
17	PROJECT PROPOSAL	YES		YES		NO		YES				YES		YES		
18	ORAL EXAM	YES				NO								NO	NO	
19																
20	YEARS MENTORS SERVE			2 (3 OPTION)		3			2		NA	1		3	1	1
21																
22	ASSISTANCE/TRAINING GIVEN TO MENTORS							YES			NA			YES	YES	
23	ADULT LEARNING THEORY		YES			NO								NO		
24	PEER OBSERVATIONCOACHING					NO								YES	YES	
25	CLINICAL TEACHING		YES			YES								YES	YES	
26																
27	USE OF MENTORS										NA					
28	INSERVICE TRAINING			YES		NO		YES				YES		YES	YES	
29	CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	YES		YES		YES		YES	YES			YES		YES	NO	YES
30	ASSISTANCE FOR TEACHERS	NO	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES			YES		YES	YES	
31	NEW TEACHERS ONLY			NO		YES								NO	NO	
32	NEW AND EXPRIENCED TEACHERS		YES	YES										YES	YES	
33																
34	ASSISTANCE TO TEACHERS		VOLUNTARY	VOLUNTARY		VOLUNTARY	VOLUNTARY	VOLUNTARY			NA			MANDATORY	VOLUNTARY	
35																
36	IMPACT OF MENTORS ON SCHOOL REFORM	MEDIUM	LOW	LOW		LOW	MEDIUM	LOW	MEDIUM		NA	LOW		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	LOW
37																
38	EXTENT TO WHICH USED:	LOW	LOW	MEDIUM		MEDIUM	LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM		NA	LOW		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	LOW
39																
40	HOW $2000 ADMINISTRATIVE MONEY IS USED										NA					
41	RELEASE TIME			YES		YES		YES	YES			YES		YES	YES	YES
42	CONFERENCESWORKSHOPS			YES		YES		YES	YES			YES		YES	YES	YES
43	MATERIALS/SUPPLIES					YES		YES				YES		YES	YES	YES
44	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT											YES		DK		
45																
46																
47	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA															
48	NA = NOT APPLICABLE															
49																
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61	176															
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE F5 B - POLICY DESCRIPTION: MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2															
3															
4			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
5			(ADA: 648,500-44,014)			(ADA: 36,393-15,132)									
6		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
7	DISTRICT HAS MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM														
8		YES	YES	YES		YES	NO								
9	SCHOOL HAS MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM														
10		YES	YES	YES		NO	NO								
11	SELECTION PROCESS CRITERIA:														
12	APPLICATION						NA								
13	INTERVIEW			YES											
14	OBSERVATION	YES	YES	YES											
15	PROVEN EFFECTIVENESS IN DEALING W/OTHER	YES	YES	YES											
16	NOMINATION														
17	PROJECT PROPOSAL			YES											
18	ORAL EXAM	YES		YES											
19				NO											
20	YEARS MENTORS SERVE														
21				2			NA								
22	ASSISTANCE/TRAINING GIVEN MENTORS														
23	ADULT LEARNING THEORY						NA								
24	PEER OBSERVATION/COACHING		YES	NO											
25	CLINICAL TEACHING			NO											
26			YES	NO											
27	USE OF MENTORS:														
28	INSERVICE TRAINING						NA								
29	CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	YES		SOME											
30	ASSISTANCE FOR TEACHERS:	YES		NO											
31	NEW TEACHERS ONLY			YES											
32	NEW AND EXPERIENCED TEACHERS		YES	NO											
33				YES											
34	ASSISTANCE TO TEACHERS														
35			VOLUNTARY				NA								
36	IMPACT OF MENTORS ON SCHOOL REFORM														
37		LOW	NONE	NONE			NA								
38	EXTENT TO WHICH USED														
39		LOW	LOW	LOW			NA								
40	HOW $2000 ADMINISTRATIVE MONEY USED														
41	RELEASE TIME						NA								
42	CONFERENCES/WORKSHOPS			YES											
43	MATERIAL SUPPLIES			YES											
44	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT			YES											
45				YES											
46															
47															
48	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA														
49	NA = NOT APPLICABLE														
50															
51															
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

TABLE F6 A - STATE POLICY: STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
4			(ADA: 646,500 44,014)			(ADA: 36,393-30,850)					(ADA: 15,132-14 091)				(ADA: 18,341 182)	
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
6																
7	MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY	VOLUNTARY	MANDATORY	VOLUNTARY		MANDATORY	BOTH	VOLUNTARY	MANDATORY		MANDATORY	BOTH		VOLUNTARY	VOLUNTARY	VOLUNTARY
8																
9	PURPOSES:															
10	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT			YES		YES	YES							YES	YES	
11	ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE					YES					YES			NO	YES	
12	CLINICAL TEACHING			YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES	YES	
13	BEGINNING TEACHERS					YES					YES			NO	YES	
14	CURRICULUM CONTENT		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES					YES	YES	
15	GENERAL PEDAGOGY			YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES	
16	ESL					NO		YES	YES			YES		NO		
17	COMPUTERS					NO		YES						LIMITED	YES	
18	EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS					NO		YES						NO	YES	
19	COOPERATIVE LEARNING					NO						YES		NO		
20	HIGHER ORDER THINKING SKILLS					YES		YES				YES		NO	YES	
21	FOLLOW UP/COACHING IS PROVIDED	NO	NO	NO		NO	NO	NO	NO		YES	NO		YES	LIMITED	
22																
23	INTENSITY OF TRAINING	LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	LOW	MEDIUM		HIGH	MEDIUM		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	
24																
25	TRAINED BY:															
26	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS					YES	YES	YES	YES		YES			YES	NO	
27	DISTRICT		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		NO	YES	
28	TEC CENTERS					NO						YES		NO	YES	
29	COUNTY					NO	YES	YES				YES		YES	YES	YES
30	MENTOR TEACHERS		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES					YES	YES	
31																
32	METHOD:															
33	MEETINGS:						YES	YES	YES						YES	
34	FORMAL		YES			YES	YES	YES	YES					YES	YES	YES
35	INFORMAL		YES			YES								YES	YES	YES
36	CONFERENCES					YES		YES	YES					YES	YES	YES
37	INSERVICE	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES	
38																
39	NEW SKILLS BEING USED IN CLASSROOM					YES					YES			LIMITED	VARIED	
40																
41																
42																
43	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA															
44																
45																
46																
47																
48																
49																
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE F8 B - STATE POLICY: STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2															
3		BIG CITY DISTRICTS				SUBURBAN DISTRICTS									
4			(ADA: 646,500 44,014)			(ADA: 36,393-15,132)									
5		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
6															
7	MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY	VOLUNTARY	MANDATORY	BOTH		BOTH	MANDATORY								
8															
9	PURPOSES:														
10	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	YES	YES	YES											
11	ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE	YES		YES			YES								
12	CLINICAL TEACHING			YES		YES	YES								
13	BEGINNING TEACHERS			YES			YES								
14	CURRICULUM CONTENT		YES	YES											
15	GENERAL PEDAGOGY			YES			YES								
16	ESL		YES	YES											
17	COMPUTERS			YES											
18	EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS		YES	NO											
19	COOPERATIVE LEARNING			NO											
20	HIGHER ORDER THINKING SKILLS			NO			YES								
21															
22	FOLLOW UP/COACHING IS PROVIDED	NO	NO	NO		NO	YES								
23															
24	INTENSITY OF TRAINING	LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM		LOW	HIGH								
25															
26	TRAINED BY:														
27	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS			YES			YES								
28	DISTRICT		YES	YES		YES	YES								
29	COMEO			YES											
30	TLC CENTERS			NO											
31	COUNTY			NO		YES									
32	MENTOR TEACHERS	YES		NO											
33															
34	METHOD:														
35	MEETINGS:														
36	FORMAL		YES	YES		YES	YES								
37	INFORMAL			NO											
38	CONFERENCES			YES											
39	INSERVICE	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES								
40															
41	NEW SKILLS BEING USED IN CLASSROOM						YES								
42															
43															
44															
45															
46	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA														
47															
48															
49															
50															
51															
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

TABLE F7A - STATE POLICY: CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER EVALUATORS - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
4			(ADA: 646,500-44,014)			(ADA: 38,393-30,850)					(ADA: 15,132-14,091)				(ADA: 18,341-182)	
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
6																
7																
8	ADMINISTRATORS HAVE BEEN TRAINED	ALL	ALL	ALL		ALL	ALL	ALL	ALL		ALL	MOST		MOST	ALL	ALL
9																
10	METHOD OF SUPERVISION TRAINED IN:															
11	CLINICAL SUPERVISION- HUNTER	YES	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
12	STULL					NO			YES		YES					
13																
14	FOLLOW UP/COACHING IS PROVIDED	YES	NO	NO		YES	YES	YES	NO		YES	NO		NO	YES	NO
15																
16	INTENSITY OF TRAINING	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM		HIGH	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM		HIGH			LOW	HIGH	LOW
17																
18	TRAINED BY:															
19	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS	YES				YES	YES	YES			YES	YES		YES		
20	DISTRICT	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES			YES	YES	YES
21																
22	ADMINISTRATORS ARE EVALUATING IN	YES	YES	NO		YES	YES	YES	NO		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
23	MANNER TRAINED															
24																
25	EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED BY:															
26	PRINCIPALS/ASS'T. PRINCIPALS	YES	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES	
27	DEPARTMENT CHAIRS		YES			NO						YES		YES	YES	
28	DISTRICT PERSONNEL					NO								NO	NO	NO
29																
30	IS THIS EVALUATION NEW?	YES		NO		NO	NO	NO	YES		NO	YES		LIMIT - YES	YES	
31	IF SO, WHEN IMPLEMENTED?	1983							1983			1984		1984	1983	
32																
33	VIEW OF POLICY:															
34	1 DID TRAINING AND THAT'S ALL		YES	YES		NO		YES	YES					YES	NO	
35	2 STIMULUS FOR LAUNCHING ADMIN. PROG	YES				NO		NO				YES			YES	
36	3 HAVE BEEN DOING A QUALITY EVAL FOR					YES	YES				YES					YES
37	SOME TIME															
38																
39																
40																
41																
42																
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48	BLANK - INCOMPLETE DATA															
49																
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																

TABLE F7 B - STATE POLICY: CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER EVALUATORS - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
3			(ADA: 646,500 44,014)			(ADA: 38,393-15,132)									
4		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
5															
6															
7	ADMINISTRATORS HAVE BEEN TRAINED	ALL	ALL	ALL		ALL	ALL								
8															
9	METHOD OF SUPERVISION TRAINED IN:														
10	CLINICAL SUPERVISION: HUNTER		YES	YES			YES								
11	STULL		YES												
12															
13	FOLLOW UP/COACHING IS PROVIDED	NO		NO		YES	YES								
14															
15	INTENSITY OF TRAINING	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM		MEDIUM	HIGH								
16															
17	TRAINED BY:														
18	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS	YES		YES		YES	YES								
19	DISTRICT	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES								
20															
21	ADMINISTRATORS ARE EVALUATING IN	NO	YES	YES		YES	YES								
22	MANNER TRAINED														
23															
24	EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED BY:														
25	PRINCIPALS/ASS'T. PRINCIPALS	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES								
26	DEPARTMENT CHAIRS			NO											
27															
28	IS THIS EVALUATION NEW?	NO	NO	NO		NO	NO								
29	IF SO, WHEN IMPLEMENTED?														
30															
31	VIEW OF POLICY:														
32	1 DID TRAINING AND THAT'S ALL	YES	YES	NO		NO	NO								
33	2 STIMULUS FOR LAUNCHING ADMIN. PROG	NO	NO	NO		NO	NO								
34	3 HAVE BEEN DOING QUALITY EVAL. FOR	NO	NO	YES		YES	YES								
35	SOME TIME														
36															
37															
38															
39															
40															
41															
42															
43															
44	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA														
45															
46															
47															
48															
49															
50															
51															
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

TABLE 18A - STATE POLICY: STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR ADMINISTRATORS - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
4		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)					(ADA: 38,393 - 30,850)				(ADA: 15132 - 14,091)				(ADA: 18,341 - 182)	
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
6																
7	MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY	MANDATORY	MANDATORY	BOTH		BOTH	BOTH	BOTH			MANDATORY			BOTH	BOTH	
8																
9	WHO GETS TRAINED?															
10	PRINCIPALS	YES	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
11	ADMINISTRATORS	YES		YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES			YES	YES	
12	MENTOR TEACHERS					YES								YES	YES	
13	TEACHERS			SOME		YES								YES	YES	
14														DK		
15	HOW MANY RECEIVE TRAINING?	ALL	ALL	ALL		ALL	ALL	ALL PRINC			ALL	ALL		ALL	ALL	
16																
17	PURPOSES:															
18	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES			YES	YES	YES
19	STRESS MANAGEMENT					YES								YES		
20	CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION		YES			YES	YES	YES	YES		YES			DK	YES	
21	DISTRICT REFORM GOALS		YES	YES		YES		YES				YES		YES	YES	
22	EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES					N	YES	
23	LEADERSHIP			YES		YES		YES						DK	YES	
24	TESTING					YES	YES							DK		
25	LEGAL ISSUES					YES		YES						NO		
26																
27	FOLLOW UP/COACHING IS PROVIDED			NO		YES		YES			YES			NO	LIMITED	
28																
29	INTENSITY OF TRAINING	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW			HIGH	LOW		LOW	MEDIUM	LOW
30																
31	TRAINED BY:															
32	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS	YES				YES	YES	YES			YES			YES	NO	
33	DISTRICT	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES			YES			YES	YES	
34	TEC CENTERS					NO								NO	YES	
35	COUNTY					YES								NO	YES	YES
36	ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING CENTERS		YES	YES		NO	YES	YES	YES					NO	YES	
37	ON-THE-JOB TRAINING		YES			YES								YES	YES	
38	PEERS					YES								NO	YES	
39																
40	METHOD															
41	MEETINGS:											YES		YES	YES	YES
42	INFORMAL	YES	YES	YES		YES								YES	YES	
43	FORMAL	YES	YES	YES		YES		YES			YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
44	INSERVICE	YES		YES		YES	YES				YES	YES		YES	YES	
45	CONFERENCES		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES						YES	YES	YES
46																
47	ADMINISTRATORS PARTICIPATE IN					NO					YES			YES	YES	
48	TEACHER TRAININGS															
49																
50																
51	BLANK - INCOMPLETE DATA															
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE F8 B - STATE POLICY: STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR ADMINISTRATORS - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2															
3															
4			BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
5		(ADA	646,500 -	44,014)		(ADA: 38,393	15,132)								
6		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
7	MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY	MANDATORY	MANDATORY	BOTH		BOTH									
8															
9	WHO RECEIVES TRAINING														
10	PRINCIPALS	YES	YES	YES			YES								
11	ADMINISTRATORS	YES		YES		YES	YES								
12	MENTOR TEACHERS			NO											
13	TEACHERS			SOME			YES								
14															
15	HOW MANY RECEIVE TRAINING	ALL	ALL	ALL		ALL	MOST								
16															
17	PURPOSES:														
18	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES								
19	STRESS MANAGEMENT			NO											
20	CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION		YES	NO		YES	YES								
21	DISTRICT REFORM GOALS		YES	YES											
22	EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS		YES	YES											
23	LEADERSHIP			NO											
24	TESTING		YES	NO		YES									
25	LEGAL ISSUES			NO											
26															
27	FOLLOW UP/COACHING IS PROVIDED	NO	YES	NO			YES								
28															
29	INTENSITY OF TRAINING	LOW	LOW	MEDIUM		MEDIUM	HIGH								
30															
31	TRAINING PROVIDED BY:														
32	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS			YES		YES	YES								
33	DISTRICT	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES								
34	TEC CENTERS			NO											
35	COUNTY			NO											
36	ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING CENTERS	YES		YES		YES									
37	ON THE JOB			YES			YES								
38	PEERS		YES	NO											
39															
40	METHOD OF TRAINING:														
41	MEETINGS:														
42	INFORMAL	YES	YES	YES											
43	FORMAL	YES	YES	YES			YES								
44	INSERVICE	YES		YES		YES	YES								
45	CONFERENCES		YES	YES		YES									
46															
47	ADMINISTRATORS MUST PARTICIPATE														
48	IN TEACHER TRAININGS			NO											
49															
50															
51															
52	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA														
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

TABLE F9 STATE POLICY: 10TH GRADE COUNSELING PROGRAM

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
4		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)				(ADA: 36,393 - 30,850)					(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)				(ADA: 18,341 - 182)	
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
6																
7	WHO CONDUCTS COUNSELING															
8	ONLY COUNSELORS					YES	YES	YES	YES					YES		
9	ONLY TEACHERS					NO					YES			NO		
10	COMBO: MOSTLY COUNSELORS	YES				NO								NO	YES	
11	COMMUNITY WORKERS	YES				NO								NO	YES	
12																
13	HOW OFTEN ARE STUDENTS COUNSELED?															
14	ONCE A YEAR		YES					YES			YES				YES	
15	TWICE A YEAR					YES								MORE		
16																
17	FOCUS OF COUNSELING:															
18	CAREER DEVELOPMENT					YES		YES						YES	YES	YES
19	COLLEGE PREP	YES	YES	YES 10TH		YES		YES	YES					NO	YES	
20	DROP OUT PREVENTION		YES			YES	YES	YES				YES		YES	YES	
21	HS COURSE PLANNING		YES	YES 8TH		YES		YES			YES			YES	YES	
22																
23	GRADE LEVEL COUNSELING IS PROVIDED	10	10	8		10	9 & 10	9 & 12	9 & 10		10	10		9 & 10	10	10
24									Y							
25	PARENTS ARE INVOLVED	YES	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		LIMITED	YES	
26																
27	HOW MONEY WAS USED:														YES	
28	HIRE COUNSELORS		YES			NO			YES					NO		
29	COMPUTERS					YES								YES		
30	PAY TEACHERS FOR COUNSELING					NO						YES		NO		
31	PAY COMMUNITY WORKERS	YES				NO								NO		
32	PAY COUNSELORS FOR OVER TIME	YES												NO	YES	
33	8TH GRADE COUNSELING			YES		NO								NO		
34														NO		
35	COUNSELOR STUDENT RATIO		1:221	1:378 10TH		1:369					1:416	1:440		1:300	1:71	1:170
36				1:350 8TH												
37																
38																
39																
40																
41																
42	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA															
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48																
49																
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE 10 A : STATE POLICY: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3																
4			BIG CITY DISTRICTS			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS					
5		(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)				(ADA: 36,393 - 30,850)					(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)				RURAL DISTRICTS	
6		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS		(ADA: 18,341 - 182)		
7	IS THERE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT?	NO	NO	YES		YES	NO	NO	NO		NO	YES		Buffalo Butte HS NO	Central Valley HS NO	Norcal HS NO
8																
9	IS THERE ACHIEVEMENT COUNCIL?	NO	NO	NO		YES	NO	NO	YES		NO	NO		NO	NO	NO
10																
11	INFLUENCE ON SCHOOL REFORM	NA	NA	HIGH		HIGH	NA	NA			NA	HIGH		NA	NA	NA
12																
13	SUBSTANTIVE FOCI:															
14	STAFF DEVELOPMENT			YES		YES						YES		NA		
15	COMPUTER SOFTWARE			YES		NO						YES		NA		
16	INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS					YES						YES		NA		
17	INSTRUCTIONAL AIDES/TUTORS			YES		YES								NA		
18	ATTENDANCE VERIFIER					YES								NA		
19	SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST					YES								NA		
20	PURCHASE COMPUTERS			YES		YES								NA		
21	RAISE QUALITY OF ED FOR:													NA		
22	RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITIES			YES		YES								NA		
23	BASIC SKILLS FOCUS			YES		YES								NA		
24																
25	INFLUENCE OF QUALITY REVIEW															
26	ON REFORM	NA	NA	MEDIUM		NONE	NA	NA	NA		NA	HIGH		NA	NA	NA
27																
28	VIEW OF THE QUALITY REVIEW	NA	NA	QUALITY		QUALITY	NA	NA	NA		NA	QUALITY		NA	NA	NA
29																
30																
31																
32																
33																
34																
35																
36																
37																
38																
39																
40																
41																
42																
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48																
49																
50	BLANK - INCOMPLETE DATA															
51	NA - NOT APPLICABLE															
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE F 10 B - STATE POLICY: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
		BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
	(ADA	646,500	44,041)		(ADA: 38,393 - 15,132)									
	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
IS THERE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	NO	YES	NO		YES	NO								
INFLUENCE ON REFORM:	NA	MEDIUM	NA			NA								
SUBSTANTIVE FOCI:														
RAISE CAP SCORES - MATH		YES			YES									
RAISE CAP SCORES - READING					YES									
STAFF DEVELOPMENT		YES			YES									
MATH LAB COORDINATOR		YES												
COMPUTERS		YES												
INFLUENCE OF REVIEW ON REFORM	NA	LOW	NA		HIGH	NA								
VIEW OF QUALITY REVIEW	NA	COMPLIANCE	NA			NA								

BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA

NA = NOT APPLICABLE

TABLE F 11 A · STATE POLICY: HOMEWORK POLICY - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
4		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)					(ADA: 36,393 - 30,850)				(ADA: 36,393 - 14,041)				(ADA: 18,341 - 182)	
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
6																
7																
8	THERE IS A DISTRICT POLICY	YES	YES	YES		YES		YES	NONE		YES			NO	YES	NO
9	DATE IMPLEMENTED		1983			1984		1970			1979			NA	1985	
10	HOMEWORK IS COLLECTED & RETURNED		NO			YES					YES			NA	YES	
11	POLICY IS USED	YES	YES			NO								NA		
12	RESULTED IN INCREASED HOMEWORK ASSIGNM	NO				NO										
13																
14	THERE IS A SITE POLICY		NO	YES		NO		YES	NONE		NO	NO		NO	YES	
15	DATE IMPLEMENTED					NA								NA	1985	
16	HOMEWORK IS COLLECTED & RETURNED					NA								NA		YES
17	POLICY IS USED					NA								NA		
18	RESULTED IN INCREASED HOMEWORK ASSIGNM					NA								NA	NO	
19																
20	IMPACT OF HOMEWORK POLICY	NONE	NONE	NONE		NONE		NONE	NONE		NONE	NONE		NONE	NONE	NONE
21																
22																
23																
24																
25																
26																
27																
28																
29																
30																
31																
32																
33																
34																
35																
36																
37																
38																
39																
40																
41																
42																
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48																
49																
50	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA															
51	NA = NOT APPLICABLE															
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE F 11B STATE POLICY HOMEWORK POLICY - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1															
2															
3		BIG CITY DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
4		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)				(ADA: 36,393 - 14,091)									
5		Capital City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
6															
7	THERE IS A DISTRICT POLICY	YES	YES	YES			YES								
8	DATE IMPLEMENTED						1979								
9	HOMEWORK IS COLLECTED & RETURNED						YES								
10	POLICY ISSUED														
11	RESULTED IN INCREASED HOMEWORK ASSIG	NO					NO								
12															
13	THERE IS A SITE POLICY	NO	YES	YES			NO								
14	DATE IMPLEMENTED			1986											
15	HOMEWORK IS COLLECTED & RETURNED														
16	POLICY ISSUED			YES											
17	RESULTED IN INCREASED HOMEWORK ASSIG			YES											
18															
19	IMPACT ON REFORM	NONE	NONE	NONE			NONE								
20															
21															
22															
23															
24															
25															
26															
27															
28															
29															
30															
31															
32															
33															
34															
35															
36															
37															
38															
39															
40															
41															
42															
43															
44															
45															
46															
47															
48															
49	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA														
50	NA = NOT APPLICABLE														
51															
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

TABLE F 12 A STATE POLICY LONGER DAY/YEAR HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3			BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
4		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)					(ADA 36,393 - 30,850)				(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)				(ADA 18,341 - 182)	
5		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
6																
7																
8	SCHOOL DAY															
9	1 LENGTH															
10	CURRENT			6 HR & 40 MN		7 HR & 51 M		6 HRS			6 HRS	7 HRS & 5 MIN		6 HRS & 50 MIN	6 HRS & 7 MIN	
11	PREVIOUS			6 HR & 30 MN												
12	2 NUMBER OF PERIODS															
13	CURRENT	7	6	6		6		5 (6 OPTION)	6		5 (6 OPTION)	6		6	7	7
14	PREVIOUS	7	5	6		6		5	5					6		7
15	3 LENGTH OF PERIODS															
16	CURRENT					55 MIN		55-60 MN	58 MIN		60 MIN	54 MIN		57 MIN	55 - 57 MIN	48 MIN
17	PREVIOUS					45 MIN			53 MIN							
18	4 DATE OF CHANGE					1984	1983				1986	1983		1983		
19	5 IMPACT	NONE				NONE	MEDIUM	NONE	HIGH		NONE			NONE	NONE	
20																
21	SCHOOL YEAR															
22	1 NUMBER OF DAYS															
23	CURRENT	180		180		186		180			180	180		180	181	180
24	PREVIOUS	180		180		181		175			176	179		175	176	
25	2 DATE OF CHANGE					1984	1983	1986			1986			1983		
26	3 IMPACT	NONE		NONE		NONE	MEDIUM	NONE			NONE			NONE		
27																
28																
29																
30																
31																
32																
33																
34																
35																
36																
37																
38																
39																
40																
41																
42																
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48	BLANK - INCOMPLETE DATA															
49																
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE 12 B : STATE POLICY: LONGER DAY/YEAR - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1														
2														
3			BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS								
4		(ADA 846,500 - 44,014)				(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)								
5		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS							
6														
7														
8	LENGTH OF DAY													
9	1 LENGTH													
10	CURRENT			6 HRS & 40 MIN			6 HRS & 25 MIN							
11	PREVIOUS													
12	2 NUMBER OF PERIODS													
13	CURRENT	7		7			6							
14	PREVIOUS	6		6										
15	3 LENGTH OF PERIODS													
16	CURRENT			55 MIN			49 MIN							
17	PREVIOUS													
18	4 DATE OF CHANGE			1984			Pre-813							
19	5 IMPACT	HIGH		NONE		NONE	MEDIUM							
20														
21	LENGTH OF YEAR													
22	1 NUMBER OF DAYS:													
23	CURRENT	180		180			180							
24	PREVIOUS	180		180			176							
25	2 DATE OF CHANGE						Pre-813							
26	3 IMPACT:	NONE	NONE	NONE			MEDIUM							
27														
28														
29														
30														
31														
32														
33														
34														
35														
36														
37														
38														
39														
40														
41														
42														
43														
44														
45														
46														
47														
48														
49	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA													
50														
51														
52														
53														
54														
55														
56														
57														
58														
59														
60														
61														
62														
63														
64														
65														

TABLE 13 A - STATE POLICY: QUALITY INDICATORS - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	11	12	1	14	15	16
1																
2																
3																
4			BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS	
5		(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)					(ADA: 36,393 - 30,850)				(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)				(ADA: 18,341 - 182)	
6		Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
7																
8	ARE THERE LOCAL INDICATORS?	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES		NO			NO	YES	NO
9																
10	INFLUENCE ON REFORM	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW		HIGH	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW		LOW	LOW		NONE	HIGH	NONE
11																
12	WHAT EFFECT ON SCHOOL DISTRICT															
13	INCREASED NUMBER OF AP COURSES		YES			NO		YES			YES	YES		NA	YES	
14	PRESSURE TO INCREASE TEST SCORES		YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES					NA	YES	
15	PRESSURE TO REDUCE DROPOUTS			YES		YES	YES	YES						NA	YES	YES
16	INCREASED ENROLLMENT IN AP COURSES					NO	YES	YES			YES			NA	YES	
17																
18	IMPACT OF STATE INDICATORS ON REFORM	NONE	LOW	MEDIUM		MEDIUM	HIGH	MEDIUM	NONE		HIGH	LOW		NONE	HIGH	LOW
19																
20																
21																
22																
23																
24																
25																
26																
27																
28																
29																
30																
31																
32																
33																
34																
35																
36																
37																
38																
39																
40																
41																
42																
43																
44																
45																
46																
47																
48	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA															
49																
50																
51																
52																
53																
54																
55																
56																
57																
58																
59																
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE 13 B STATE POLICY: QUALITY INDICATORS - JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1							
2							
3			BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS	
4		(ADA	648,500 -	44,014)		(ADA: 38,393 -	14,091)
5		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS
6							
7	ARE THERE LOCAL INDICATORS?	YES	YES	YES		YES	NONE
8							
9	INFLUENCE ON REFORM	MEDIUM		LOW		MEDIUM	NONE
10							
11	WHAT EFFECT ON SCHOOL/DISTRICT:						NONE
12	INCREASED NUMBER OF AP COURSES						
13	INCREASED ENROLLMENT IN AP COURSES					YES	
14	PRESSURE TO INCREASE TEST SCORES	YES	YES	YES		YES	
15	PRESSURE TO REDUCE DROP OUTS			YES		YES	
16							
17	IMPACT OF STATE INDICATORS ON REFORM	MEDIUM LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM		MEDIUM	NONE
49	BLANK = INCOMPLETE DATA						

Appendix G

Implementation Variables

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE G: IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT

1. All schools used cross role teaming (CRT) to varying degrees (limited -moderate- high) to assist with the planning and/or implementation of the reforms.

    a. Three schools used CRT to a high degree: LA Metro HS, LA Metro MS, and Central Valley HS.
    b. Four schools used CRT to a limited degree: Socal HS, Socal MS, Buffalo Butte HS, and Norcal HS.

2. No school used the label "cross role teaming" or "cross role team" to describe the collaborative approach to implementation management, but all schools did use some form of teacher-department head, teacher-administrator, or teacher-central office teaming.

    a. Only a two schools (LA City HS and JHS) used the "textbook" model for CRT that included teachers, site level administrators, district office support staff, and an external change agent.
    b. Several schools (Socal HS, Desert HS, Orange County HS, Tri-County HS, Buffalo Butte HS, and LA City JHS) used the School Improvement Program's School Site Council as a CRT.

3. While many schools created new structures by which to implement SB 813 reform related tasks or responsibilities, most used existing structures and procedures, e.g., departments and department meetings, principal advisory committees, district curriculum/textbook committees, superintendent cabinets, etc.

    a. CRT were used most frequently for curriculum alignment (14/17 schools) and textbook selection (13/17 schools), curriculum development (9/17 schools), and planning (8/17 schools)
    b. CRT were least used for managing implementation strategies related to graduation requirements (3/17 school), and counseling (5/17 schools)

4. Implementation management was generally centralized (12/17 schools) with a few (3/17) using more decentralized approach Two schools (Buffalo Butte and Norcal) had no evidence of an implementation plan.

5. Overall ratings for Implementation Management:

COMPONENTS	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW MOD	LOW
a. Cross Role Teaming	7	2	1	7
b. Implementation Plans	3.	5	1	8
c. Overall Implementation Mgt...	4	7	1	5

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE H:
INITIAL CONTENT, SKILL, AWARENESS TRAINING

1. All schools provided reform related training.for their administrators

   a. Most frequently mentioned training sessions included:
      1. Clinical Supervision (15/17)
      2. Instructional Leadership (11/17)

   b. Least mentioned areas for administrative training:
      1. Needs Assessment (3/17)
      2. School Improvement Process (4/17)

   c. Training was condicted using a cyclical process in 12/17 schools.

   d. Follow-up and coaching was used in 6/17 schools.

2. All schools provided reform related training for their teachers.

   a. Most frequently mentioned training sessions included:
      1. Content specific pedagogy (15/17)
      2. Cross role teaming training (14/17)
      3. Mentor training (13/17)
      4. Curriculum or subject area content (13/17)
      5. Effective teaching (12/17)

   b. Least mentioned areas for teacher training
      1. Classroom management (6/17)

   c. Training was condicted using a cyclical process in 10/17 schools.

   d. Follow-up and coaching was used in 7/17 schools.

3. Overall ratings for Initial Content, Skill, and Awareness Training:

COMPONENT	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
a. Administrator Initial Training	3.	8	6
b. Teacher Initial Training	4	7	6

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE J: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CHANGE, AND ALIGNMENT

1. All schools except Buffalo Butte showed evidence of curriculum development in math, science, and English.

2. More than half of the schools (9/17) had developed materials that reflected a qualitative change in the curriculum i.e., greater content depth, enriched content, higher order thinking, or critical thinking skill. However, this attention was minimal and does not reflect a major effort on the part of these schools.

3. Most schools (13/17) gave evidence of developing instructional materials that supported reading and/or writing across the curriculum.

4. Most schools (14/17) gave evidence of developing curriculum materials that would assist students in improving test scores e.g., CAP preparation materials

5. Many schools (12/17) gave evidence of developing units or courses for English as a Second Language (ESL) students

6. More than half of the schools (9/17) had developed materials that reflected a qualitative change in the curriculum i.e., greater content depth, enriched content, higher order thinking, or critical thinking skill. However, this attention was minimal and does not reflect a major effort on the part of these schools.

6. All schools provided evidence of increased curriculum alignment activity that was directly related to the reform effort.

   a. Activities centered most frequently on alignment of courses of study with Model Curriculum Standards (16/17), textbooks (13/17) , and tests (12/17).
   b. Some schools (4/17) gave attention to curriculum alignment related to Special Population needs.

7. Most schools (12/17) used a curriculum change process that was district driven and "top-down." Others, like Desert and Socal High, used a mixed "top-down and bottom-out" process. Central Valley used a "middle-out" process. And Tri-County used a "bottom-up" process.

8. All schools made use of a some kind of plan for guiding or directing the curriculum change process. Most school curuculum change efforts (13/17) were district initiated and driven.

9. District-wide centralization of the curriculum was increased in 11/17 schools; decreased in one school(Socal High); and not changed in 5/17 schools.

   a. Three of the no change schools (LA Metro High, LA Metro Junior High, and Socal Junior High) were already highly centralized
   b. Another no change school, Norcal, is a single school, school district.
   c. Buffalo Butte was the fifth no change school.

10. Uniformity in the curriculum was increased in 11/17 schools, decreased in 3/17 schools, and no change in 3/17 schools.

11. Articulation was increased in 13/17 schools and not change in 7/17 schools.

12. Staff development training was combined with curriculum development in 14/17 schools and included up-front training for 14/17 schools and ongoing training for 8/17 schools.

13. The rationale for curriculum development activities was most frequently given as a combination of SB 813 policies and ongoing district or school policies that pre-dated SB 813. Three of the schools (LA Metro High, LA Metro Junior High, and Buffalo Butte) specifically reported curriculum reform efforts that were primarily driven by SB 813. Four schools (Socal High, Socal Junior High, Desert High, and East Bay Middle School) reported efforts that were driven by pre-SB 813 local policies.

14. Overall ratings for Curriculum Development, change, and alignment:

COMPONENT	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW-MOD	LOW
1. Curriculum Development	9	6.		2
2. Quality Change	0	6	1	10
3. Curriculum Alignment	11	5		1

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE K1: ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT AND LEADERSHIP

1. All administrators demonstrated evidence of symbolic commitment to reform related policies and practices. Administrators exhibited the following behaviors demonstrative of symbolic support:

    a. Being knowledgeable of the program (13/17 schools)
    b. Appearing at training sessions (9/17)
    c. Allocating necessary resources (9/17)
    d. Insisting on program continuation (12/17)

2. Administrators in all schools except LA City High demonstrated technical commitment to the reform effort. Technical commitment was demonstrated by the following behaviors:

    a. Giving direct assistance to teachers (12/17 schools)
    b. Participating in intial (6/17) and ongoing (9/17) training sessions
    c. Budgeting and expending funds for program continuation (11/17)

3. All administrators demonstrated evidence of leadership related to guiding and directing reform policies and practices. Administrators exhibited the following leadership behaviors or characteristics:

    a. Being perceived as a curriculum and instruction specialist (10/17)
    b. Being perceived as a change expert (13/17)
    c. Showing leadership through supportive actions (17/17)
    d. Actively supporting the facilitators of the reform effort (10/17)
    e. Guiding the reform effort to full implementation (13/17)
    f. Making program supportive decisions (12/17)

4. Overall ratings for Administrative Commitment and Leadership:

COMPONENT	HIGH	MOD-HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
a. Adm Commitment	8.		6.	3
b. Adm Leadership	0	1	7	3

IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE K2:
ADMINISTRATIVE PRESSURE AND MONITORING

1. Evidence of administrative pressure for implementation of the reform effort was present to some degree at 15/17 schools and not present at 2/17 schools (Capitol City High and Middle School).

2. Administrative pressure for full implementation was in evidence during implementation stages at most sites (15/17).

   a. Pressure during early implementation stages was present in 15/17 schools and not present in 2/17 schools (Capitol HS & MS).
   b. Pressure during later implementation stages 13/16 schools and not present in 3/16 schools (Capitol HS & MS and Buffalo Butte). Peninsula was not rated for this component because it was still in the early implementation stage.

3. Administrative pressure for continued assistance was in evidence at more than half of the schools (10/16). Peninsula was not rated.

4. Evidence of administrative monitoring the program was present in most of the schools (15/16) and not present in one school (Capitol High). Peninsula was not rated for any of the administrative monitoring components.

5. Monitoring for program process was conducted in 13/16 schools; not conducted in 3/16 schools (Capitol City, LA City, and Tri-County).

6. Monitoring for program fidelity was conducted in 9/16 schools; not conducted in 7/16 schools.

7. Monitoring for staff concerns was conducted in 14/16 schools; not conducted in 2/16 schools (Buffalo Butte and Capitol City MS).

8. Monitoring program for evaluation purposes prior to full implementation was conducted by 6/16 schools; not conducted by 9/16 schools.

9. Overall ratings for Administrative Pressure and Monitoring:

COMPONENT	HIGH	MOD	LOW	NONE	NA
a. Adm Pressure	3	3	9	1	1
b. Adm Monitoring.	4	4	7	1	1

SUMMARY OF CAUSAL FACTOR L:
LATITUDE AND FIDELITY

1. Evidence for both high and low latitude was found in 11/16 schools; high latitude only in 3/16 (LA Metro High, LA Middle School, and East Bay Middle School) ; low latitude only in 2/16 (Bufallo Butte and LA City Junior High); and one school (Peninsula) was not rated on this causal factor.

2. Generally, the degree of latitude was evenly split across the sixteen schools rated: high in 5/16 schools; moderate in 5/16; and low in 6/16.

3. The degree of pressure for maintaining low latitude varied from "none at all" to "high pressure" with most schools using high or moderate pressure.

    a. 7/16 schools used high pressure.
    b. 5/16 schools used moderate pressure.
    c. 3/16 schools used low pressure.
    d. 1/16 schools used no pressure.

4. Blunting or trivilization was found to exist in more than half of the schools (9/16).

5. Adaptations were most frequently found to occure in the earlier stages of implementation However, adaptions continued to occure into later implementation stages Only two schools (LA Metro High and Middle School) allowed no adaptations

    a. 6/16 schools had evidence of early only adaptions.
    b. 5/16 schools experienced adaptations over time.
    c. 2/16 schools experience both initial and over time adaptations.
    d. 2/16 schools did not allow adaptions.

6. Most schools (10/16) provided evidence that a mix of high and low fidelity took place. Two schools (LA Metro High and Middle School) experienced only high fidelity; while, four of the schools (Desert, Buffalo Butte, LA City JH, and East Bay MS) experienced only low fidelity.

7. The authority for changes being made in the program tended to reside with in a variety of locations:

    a. 3/16 schools had district only authorized changes
    b. 6/16 schools had district and school authorized changes.
    c. 4/16 schools had school only authorized changes.
    d. 1/16 schools had teacher authorized changes.
    e. 2/16 schools did not allow changes (Some exceptions were made and these had to be approved by the district office.)

8. Generally, the source for pressure for high fidelity came from the district office (8/16 schools) or a combination of district and school administration (3/16). In two cases, the school (Tri-County and Norcal) was the sole source for pressure. In one case (LA City JH), the department was the main source for pressure. In two cases (Desert and Buffalo Butte) there was no pressure.

9. In 12/16 schools, there was a close match between the planned program and the program as implemented in practice.

10. Overall ratings for Latitude and Fidelity:

COMPONENTS	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NA
1. Latitude	5	5	6	1
2. Fidelity	5	6	5	1

IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE M1:
EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL LINKING AGENTS FOR ONGOING ASSISTANCE

1. External Linking Agents (ELA) were used in half of the school 8/16. Peninsula was not assessed for this causal factor because it was still in the early implementation stages.

2. In the eight schools that used ELA's, four had evidence of providing high quality service that included:

   a. Being accepted as a credible person (4/8 schools)
   b. Conducting user oriented assistance (3/8 schools)
   c. Providing concrete and continuous assistance (2/8 schools)

3. Most of the schools used ELA's during the initial implementation stages (4/8 schools) and they provided training for internal trainers (4/8 schools).

4. Very few of the ELA's provided other types of assistance found to be effective for ongoing training:

   a. Providing logistical support (2/8 schools)
   b. Conducting demonstrations (1/8 schools)
   c. Providing on-site follow-up and coaching (1/8 schools)
   d. Identifying resources (1/8 schools)
   e. Aiding in program continuation (2/8 schools)
   f. Varying assistance over time (2/8 schools)

5. More than half of the schools (5/8) that used ELA reported a close fit between the ELA and the school Internal Linking Agents (ILA).

   a. Only one (Desert) reported evidence that the ELA actively coordinated ELA and ILA assistance
   b. Only one (Desert) reported evidence that the ELA actively developed the bridging skills that would enable transfer of responsiblity of ongoing assistance and full implementation from ELA to the ILA and the classroom teacher.

6. All of the schools utilized central office personnel as Internal Linking Agents (ILA) to some degree in the provision of both symbolic (16/16 schools) and technical support (16/16 schools) for the reform effort.

7 The prinicipal was an active participant in the change process in all but two schools (Socal High and Socal Junior High). In the Socal schools, the prinicpals saw themselves as supporting change but not as the change or curriculum experts directing the change process.

   a. In most schools, the principal and/or other members of the school administrative team (Asst Principal of Instruction, Coordinators, etc), were very active in providing substancial, direct on-going assistance to teachers involved in the change process.
   b. In some schools (Socal High, Socal JH, Capitol High, and LA Metro MS), the principals were not a substantial force in the change process. For example, in the Socal schools, the principals did not see themselves as curriculum specialists or change experts, and saw their role as "hiring the best teachers and maintaining a climate that gave them freedom to teach." While they provided teachers with indirect assistance, they did not provide substantial, direct ongoing assistance. The ongoing assistance in the Socal schools was provided primarily by the district office and classroom teachers working in departments or in informal collaborative units. The teacher collaborative efforts were felt to be the most effective driving force for reform.

8. In addition to the principal and other memebers of the school administrative team (Asst Prinicipals, etc.), several schools used other ILA's that included Mentors (6/16 schools), Department Chairs (6/16 schools), and teacher committees or collaborative teams (7/16 schools).

9. Overall ratings for External and Internal Linking Agents for Ongoing Assistance:

COMPONENTS	HIGH	MOD	LOW-MOD	LOW	NOT USED	NA
a. External Linking Agents	1	3	0	4	8	1
b. Internal Linking Agents.	4	5	1	6	0	1

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE M2: CONTENT, TIME, INTENSITY, AND TYPE OF ONGOING ASSISTANCE

1. All of the schools except Norcal provided administrators and teachers with some type of ongoing content assistance related to SB 813 reforms. Peninsula was not assessed for this causal factor because it was still in the initial stages of the implementation process.

    a. Norcal is a single administrator school-school district, which provided its teachers and its administrator with ongoing assistance.
    b. 11/16 schools provided ongoing assistance to administrators in clinical supervision, teacher evaluation, and classroom management.
    c. 10/16 schools provided ongoing assistance to teachers in clinical teaching, classroom management, and general pedagogy
    d. Teachers also received ongoing assistance in math (3/16), science (2/16), English (5/16), social studies (2/16), and CAP preparation or testing (2/16).
    e. Three schools (Capitol City High, Capitol City MS, and Buffalo Butte) were found to have limited ongoing assistance and no coherent program for ongoing assitance. The initiation of ongoing assistance at Buffalo Butte was attributed to SB 813. The Capitol City schools have recently identified staff development as a high priority with planned changes leading toward greater ongoing assistance.

2. Time of assistance varied among the schools (9/16) that provided evidence of training periods:

    a. Administrators received ongoing training lasting longer than 1 day in 2/9 schools, longer than 2 days in 7/9 schools, and longer than 4 days in 3/9 schools.
    b. Teachers recreived ongoing training lasting longer than 1 day in 1/9 schools, longer than 2 days in none of the schools, and longer than 4 days in 3 of the schools.

3. Seven schools gave evidence of administrative ongoing assistance that was "structured and thorough." Five schools gave evidence of the "structured and thorough" pattern for teacher ongoing training. Other patterns for ongoing assistance were mixed.

4. The intensity of ongoing assistance was reported as high for administrators in only 2/9 reporting schools (LA Metro High and LA Metro MS); moderate in 4/9 reporting schools, low in 3/9 reporting schools.

5. The intensity of ongoing assistance was reported as high for teachers in only 2/10 reporting schools (LA Metro High and MS), moderate in 4/10 schools, and low in 4/10 schools. Norcal was the 10th school which reported low intensive ongoing assitance for teachers but no ongoing assistance for its single administrator.

6. Thirteen schools provided evidence of the type of ongoing assistance for administrators.

    a. Administrators receive ongoing assistance that was actual training (11/13), structured (11/13), and/or scheduled (11/13). One school (Buffalo Butte) reported ongoing assistance that was haphazard and one school (Norcal) reported no training for its administrator.
    b. Administrators also recieved ongoing assistance that was problem solving (4/13) in nature and informal (4/13).

7. Thirteen schools provided evidence of the type of ongoing assistance for teacher.

    a. Teachers receive ongoing assistance that was actual training (12/13), structured (9/13), and/or scheduled (11/13). Two schools (Buffalo Butte and Central Valley) also reported evidence of haphazard ongoing assistance.
    b. Teachers also recieved ongoing assistance that was problem solving (3/13) in and informal (5/13).

8. All schools provided evidence of ongoing training of some degree related to staff development or administrative training that included aspects of SB 813 reforms:

    a. Most frequently mentioned ongoing assistance for administrators was related to new teacher evaluation requirements, administrative certification, and clinical teaching (11/13 schools)
    b. The most frequently mentioned areas for teachers was clinical teaching and classroom management or assertive discipline (10/13). Other areas included Model Curriculum Standards (8/13), textbooks (6/13), CAP testing (2/13), new evaluation system (1/13) and the School Improvement Quality Review process (1/13).

9. Overall ratings for Content, Time, Entenisty, and Type of Ongoing Assistance:

COMPONENTS	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NA
1. Overall Assessment	2	4	10	1
2. Adm Ongoing Assistance	2	4	10	1
3. Teacher Ongoing Assistance	2	4	10	1

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE N:
TEACHER EFFORT

1. 9/11 high schools and 5/5 junior high/middle schools show active teacher effort in the reform process. There is substantial evidence of both physical and psychological engagement in reform related activities.

   a. HIGH SCHOOLS: Capitol City, LA City, Socal, Desert, East Bay, Orange, LA Metro, Tri-County, Central Valley
   b. JH/M SCHOOLS: Capitol City, LA City, Socal, East Bay, LA Metro

2. 2/11 high schools (Buffalo Butte and Norcal) reported a low degree of teacher involvement in the reforms. This was indicative of schools that have less than half of the essential components for teacher effort in place.

3. 4/11 high schools (East Bay, LA Metro, Tri-County, and Central Valley) and 1/5 junior high school (LA City JH) showed evidence that all essential components for teacher effort were in place. This was indicative of a high degree of teacher effort in achieving practice mastery of reform skills and knowledge.

4. Of the 14 schools demonstrating a moderate to high degree of physical engagement in the reform:

   a. 10/14 schools presented evidence of active teacher effort to achieve mastery
   b. 14/14 schools presented evidence of teacher effort to apply mastery in practice.

5. Of the 14 schools demonstrating a moderate to high degree of psychological effort:

   a. 14/14 schools presented evidence of teacher interest in learning new skills
   b. 13/14 schools presented evidence of teacher interest in applying new skills
   c. 10/14 schools presented evidence of teacher interest in refining skills

6. Overall rating for Teacher Effort:

COMPONENT	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NA
a. Teacher Effort.	5	9	2	1

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE P: TEACHER SKILL MASTERY

1. Evidence of teacher skill mastery was present in 10/16 schools; not present in 4/16 schools (LA City High, Desert, Buffalo Butte, and East Bay MS); not assessed in 2/16 schools (Capitol City High and Capitol City MS). Peninsula was not assessed for this factor. In LA City High, there was evidence of skill mastery demonstrated by lead teachers; however, most of the regular classroom teachers were still operating at a developemental level as opposed to a mastery level.

2. Staff efficacy was present in 12/16 schools and not present in 4/16 schools (LA City High, Desert, Buffalo Butte, and East Bay MS).

3. Teachers were working on program refinements in 10/16 schools; not working on program refinements in 4/16 schools (LA City High, Desert, Buffalo Butte, and East Bay MS); and not assessed in 2/16 schools (Capitol City High and Tri-County).

4. The four schools not evidencing skill mastery were the same schools that did not evidence teacher efficacy or program refinements and integration.

5. In all cases where the three variables were assessed for skill mastery, teacher efficacy, and program refinements and integration, there was a positive and direct correspondance. For exampel, if they had demonstrated evidence of presence in one, it was also present in the other two.

6. The staff was found to be getting the expected results in more than a third of the assessed schools (7/16).

7. The staff was found to be spending more time on program refinements and integration in 7/12 schools. With two exceptions (Desert and Capitol City MS), these tended to be the same schools that were getting the expected results.

8. In half of the schools (8/16), teachers were concerned about student outcomes.

9. In less than a third of the schools (5/16), teachers were concerned about getting additional training.

10. Overall rating for Teacher Skill Mastery:

COMPONENTS	HIGH	MOD	LOW-MOD	LOW	DK	NA
a. Teacher Skill Mastery	5	3	2	4	2	1

(DK = Data gather could not assess and therefore, "didn't know.")

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE Q:
TEACHER COMMITMENT

1. Personal or psychological commitment was present in all of the assessed schools. Peninsula was not assessed for this causal factor.

2. Personal or psychological commitment was evidenced in 16/16 schools through teacher actions that demonstrated a desire for program continuation..

- a Programs most frequently mentioned for continuation included:
    - 1) Model Curriculum Standards and curriculum alignment
    - 2) Clinical supervision and instructional Improvement
    - 3.) CAP test
- b. Other programs mentioned included:
    - 1) Textbook selection
    - 2) High school graduation requirements
    - 3) Course development
    - 4) Staff Development

3. Teacher actions demonstrating a desire for program expansion was present in 9/16 schools.

4. Institutional commitment was found to be present in more than 75% of the schools (13/16).

- a. District support for institutionalization of the program was found to be present in 13/16 schools. One school (Capitol City High) had "mixed" evidence of district support. One school (Socal High) could not be assessed. Only one school (Socal JH), was found not to exhibit sufficient district support. for institutionalization of the SB 813 reforms
- b. School support for institutionalization of the program was found to be present in all schools (16/16).

5. Most frequently mentioned programs receiving school support included:

- a. General overall support of SB 813 programs
- b. Increased academic rigor and graduation requiremen
- c. Higher order thinking emphasis
- d. Integrated reading and writing emphasis
- e. Quality indicators
- f. Tenth grade counseling program
- g. Model Curriculum Standards

6. Most frequently mentioned programs not receiving school support included:

- a. Mentor Teachers Program
- b. Model Curriculum Standards (Specifically Mathematics)
- c. Quality Indicators

7. Overall rating for Teacher Commitment:

COMPONENTS	HIGH	MOD-HIGH	MOD	LOW	NA
a. Institutional Commitment	6	0	7	3	1
b. Teacher Commitment	7	1	4	4	1

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLE R: EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

1. All fourteen schools assessed for this factor demonstrated evidence of implementation of the curriculum reform effort. Three schools (Peninsula, Socal High, and Socal JH) were not assessed One school (Capital City High) could not be rated by the data gatherer.

2. Of the schools rated, evidence supported course content changes in14/14 schools; course quality changes in 10/14 schools; and special population integration in 7/14 schools.

3. Instructional improvement was present in 13/14 schools.

    a. Higher order thinking was in evidence in 8/14 schools.
    b. Ongoing staff developement had been established in 5/14 schools.

4. Instructional supervision improvement was present in 9/14 schools with ongoing administrative implementation in 7/14 schools

5. SB 813 policies were implemented to varying degrees by different schools. The following table presents the policy and the number of schools that implemented the policy to the specified degree:

SB 813 POLICY	HIGH	MOD-HI	MOD	MOD-LOW	LOW	NA
a. Graduation Requirements	15	0	0	0	0	2
b. Model Curr Standards	15	0	0	0	0	2
c. Textbook Selection	14	0	2	0	1	0
d. New CAP Testing	3	1	3	1	7	2
e. Mentor Teacher Program	8	1	5	0	1	2
f. Staff Development	11	3	3	0	0	0
g. SI Prog Quality Review	4	0	0	0	2	11
h. Tchr Eval/Adm Certification	9	1	4	0	1	2
i. Adm Staff Development	5	0	6	0	6	0
j. School Improvement Program	6	0	0	0	0	11
k. Homework	10	1	1	0	3	2
l. Tenth Grade Counseling	14	0	0	0	0	3
m. Longer Day/Year	16	0	0	0	0	1
n. Quality Indicators	8	2	5	0	1	1

6. Overall rating for Extent of Implementation:

COMPONENTS	HIGH	HIGH-MOD	MOD	LOW	NA
a. District Implementation	3	2	7	2	3
b. School Implementation	3	2	8	1	3

TABLE G1 A SUMMARY CHART OF EARLY AND FULL IMPLEMENTATION STAGE CAUSAL FACTORS

1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17
		BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS	
	(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)			(ADA: 38,393 - 30,850)				(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)			(18,341 - 182)	
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES	Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
G: IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW-MOD	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
CROSS ROLE TEAMING	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW-MOD	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	LOW
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	LOW MOD	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	LOW
H: INITIAL TRAINING (CONTENT, SKILL...)	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE
TEACHER TRAINING	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE
J: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
QUALITATIVE CHANGE	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	LOW-MOD	MODERATE
CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
K: ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
LEADERSHIP	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MOD - HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
PRESSURE	LOW	LOW	LOW MOD	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW
MONITORING	LOW	LOW	LOW MOD	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW
L: PROGRAM LATITUDE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	NA	LOW	LOW(S)-HI(D)	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
DEGREE OF FIDELITY	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	HI(S)-LOW(D)	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
M: DISTRICT ONGOING ASSISTANCE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE
SCHOOL ONGOING ASSISTANCE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE
EXTERNAL LINKING AGENT	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	NOT USED	MODERATE	NA	MODERATE	NOT USED	LOW	NOT USED	NOT USED
INTERNAL LINKING AGENT	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
N: TEACHER EFFORT	MIXED	MIXED	MIXED	MIXED	HIGH	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW
P: TEACHER SKILL MASTERY	NA	LOW MOD	MOD	LOW	HIGH	LOW	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	LOW MOD
Q: TEACHER COMMITMENT	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	NA	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW
INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	NA	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
R: EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	MOD - HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	MOD - HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
SCHOOL IMPLEMENTATION	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	MOD - HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
OTHER COMPARATIVE FIELDS												
SIP PROGRAM	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	ACHMT COUNCIL	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
OTHER PROG'S (551 65-803 LEP)		EIA LEP		SCE-LEP-CHI	AB 551	SCE-LEP-CHI	PACKARD GRNT	NI	SCE-LEP-CHI	SCE-LEP-IND ED	SCE-LEP-551-85	SCE-LEP-CHI
COURT/VOLUNTARY INTEGRATION	NEITHER	COURT ORDER	COURT ORDER	VOLUNTARY	NEITHER	NEITHER	COURT ORDER	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER	NEITHER
TOP-DOWN OR BOTTOM UP CHANGE	MUTUAL	TOP DOWN	MIXED	MIXED	TOP-DOWN	TOP-DOWN	TOP-DOWN	TOP-DOWN	BOTTOM-UP	BOTTOM-UP	MIDDLE-OUT	NA
TIGHT/LOOSE DIST-SCHL COUPLING	LOOSE	LOOSE	MIXED	MODERATE	TIGHT	TIGHT	TIGHT	TIGHT	LOOSE	LOOSE	LOOSE	TIGHT
DEGREE OF CAP TEST EMPHASIS	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
INCREASED CENTRALIZATION	YES	YES	NO CHANGE	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO CHANGE	YES	LOW BUT INCRSNG	YES	NO CHANGE
OTHER COMMENTS	Dist has a 7yr cycle but no written implementation plan	Dept Chairs played key role in the reform effort	SIP prog had positive influence on reform effort	813 reforms were a small piece of a larger plan	Each schl in dist required to develp sit imprv plan	Prin, prin sec 2 VP's, & counselor left Sp 1986.	The school's Achievmt Cncl provides SIP atmosphere	Dist had 5 yr plan for curr develp and inst. improv.	Dist laisse faire mgt approach is shifting to be more directive	SB 813 facilitated change in dist lacking in adm leadership	Availability of competitive $ facilitated schl reform effort	Single adm schl w/ many single tchr departments

DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS, ROUND 1&2 CASE STUDIES AND OUTCOME REPORTS

TABLE G1 B SUMMARY CHART OF EARLY AND FULL IMPLEMENTATION STAGE CAUSAL FACTORS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1			DECISION RULES	HIGH = Most or all component parts implemented													
2				MOD = At least half of the component parts implemented													
3				LOW = Less than half of the component parts implemented													
4				DK = Data gatherer "did not know."													
5			BIG CITY				MEDIUM DISTRICTS										
6			(ADA 648,500 - 44,014)				(ADA 36,393 - 15,132)										
7	IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES		Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS									
8	G IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT		MODERATE	HIGH	LOW		LOW	HIGH									
9	CROSS ROLE TEAMING		MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW		LOW	HIGH									
10	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN		LOW MOD	HIGH	LOW		LOW	HIGH									
11																	
12	H INITIAL TRAINING (CONTENT, SKILL)		LOW	MODERATE	LOW		LOW	HIGH									
13	ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING		LOW	MODERATE	LOW		LOW	HIGH									
14	TEACHER TRAINING		LOW	MODERATE	LOW		LOW	HIGH									
15																	
16	J CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT		MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH		HIGH	HIGH									
17	QUALITATIVE CHANGE		LOW	MODERATE	LOW		MODERATE	HIGH									
18	CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT		HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE		HIGH	HIGH									
19																	
20	K ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT		LOW	HIGH	MODERATE		MODERATE	HIGH									
21	LEADERSHIP		LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE		MODERATE	HIGH									
22	PRESSURE		LOW	LOW	LOW MOD		LOW	HIGH									
23	MONITORING		LOW	LOW	LOW MOD		LOW	HIGH									
24																	
25	L PROGRAM LATITUDE		LOW	HIGH	MODERATE		MODERATE	LOW									
26	DEGREE OF FIDELITY		MODERATE	LOW	LOW		LOW	HIGH									
27																	
28	M DISTRICT ONGOING ASSISTANCE		LOW	MODERATE	LOW		MODERATE	HIGH									
29	SCHOOL ONGOING ASSISTANCE		LOW	HIGH	LOW		MODERATE	HIGH									
30	EXTERNAL LINKING AGENT		LOW	NOT USED	LOW		NOT USED	MODERATE									
31	INTERNAL LINKING AGENT		LOW	LOW	LOW			HIGH									
32																	
33	N TEACHER EFFORT		MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE		MODERATE	HIGH									
34																	
35	P TEACHER SKILL MASTERY		NA	MODERATE	HIGH		LOW	HIGH									
36																	
37	Q TEACHER COMMITMENT		MODERATE	MOD HIGH	MODERATE		HIGH	HIGH									
38	INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT		MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW		HIGH	HIGH									
39																	
40	R EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION		MODERATE	MODERATE	NA		MODERATE	MOD-HIGH									
41	DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION		MODERATE	MODERATE	NA		LOW	MOD-HIGH									
42	SCHOOL IMPLEMENTATION		MODERATE	MODERATE	NA		MODERATE	MOD-HIGH									
43																	
44	OTHER COMPARATIVE FIELDS																
45	SIP PROGRAM		NO	SIP SCHOOL	NO		NO	NO									
46	OTHER PROG'S (551 65 803 IEP)		AB 551	IEP-GATE MAG	CH1-551-803		AB 551	NO									
47	COURT/VOLUNTARY INTEGRATION		NEITHER	COURT ORDER	COURT ORDER		NEITHER	NEITHER									
48	TOP DOWN OR BOTTOM UP CHANGE		MUTUAL	TOP DOWN	MIXED		TOP-DOWN	TOP DOWN									
49	TIGHT/LOOSE DIST-SCHL COUPLING		LOOSE	LOOSE	MIXED		MIXED	TIGHT									
50	DEGREE OF CAP TEST EMPHASIS		HIGH	HIGH	LOW		HIGH	HIGH									
51	INCREASED CENTRALIZATION		YES	YES	NO CHANGE		YES	NO CHANGE									
52																	
53	OTHER COMMENTS		District has a	Dept Chairs	Supportive		School has	District has a									
54			7yr curr cycle	played key	climate for		developed	5 yr plan for									
55			but no written	implementa-	change is		own improve-	curr devlpmt									
56			plan	tion role	missing		ment plan	& inst imprvmt									
57																	
58	DATA SOURCE CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS, ROU																
59																	
60																	
61																	
62																	
63																	
64																	
65																	
66																	

TABLE G2 A CAUSAL FAC...G IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17
1			BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS	
2			(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)		(ADA 36,390 - 30,850)				(ADA 15,132 - 14,091)			(ADA 16,341 - 192)	
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
4	CROSS ROLE TEAMING	YES	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES	NO	YES	YES (SITE)	YES/HIGH	YES/MODERATE	YES (LIMITED)	YES/HIGH	YES (LIMITED)
5	TEAM MEMBERSHIP	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3-4-5-6-	1-2-3-5-(8)	1-2-3-4-5-6-	1	1-2-3-5-6-7	2-3-5-7-8	1-2-3-5	1-2-5	1-2-8-9	1-2-3-4-5-6	1-2-5
6	1 CENTRAL OFFICE 6 COUNSELORS	Strong initial	7-8-10-Mny	Dist CRT used in	7-8-9	tp lvl dist mngt	Sev CRTs funct	Site Achvmt Cncl	CRT's formed	CRT's used to	CRTS used to	CRT's used by	Sml sz of sit
7	2 PRIN OR V PRIN 7 CONSULTANTS	CRT effort to	CRTs exst to	textbk selectn	CRTS func in	initiates ref imp	in dev strat to	funded by grant	each time curr	implement cur	create dist gls	dist for repre-	migates agnst
8	3 DEPT CHAIRS 8 COMMUNITY	put reform in	dev impl plns f	Ad hoc task	dev strat to	codified in indv	attn gls of dist-	from private corp	change occurs	changes & other	& at site on cur	sentative input	CRTs
9	4 MENTORS 9 STUDENTS	place w/little	all aspcts of	forces estab-	attn gls of	schl perf plns	achv coun	Dist task forces	to work during	813 reforms	comp	from schl to	
10	5 TEACHERS 10 OTHERS	ongoing effort	curr/SB 813 r	lished by supt	dist-achv coun			being developed	summer	Members = 7-10		reform chngs	
11	LEVEL OF OPERATIONS	1	1-2-3	1	1-2-3	1	1-2-3	3-Achvmt Cncl	1	1	2-3	1-2-3	2 (SAME)
12	1 DISTRICT TEAM							1-Dist plan for	Dist level CRT's			A number of CRT	
13	2 DISTRICT SITE TEAM					No frml trng		site tchr invlvmt	aided site level			are used at dist	
14	3 SITE TEAM					provided	2-3	not yet implem'd	implementat'n			and schl level	
15	TYPE OF TRAINING	1 Adm	1 Adm/mis/	2		No forml trng	Inst spclst inserv	1-Ach Cncl	2	2	No frml trng	2	No frml trng
16	1 FORMAL UPFRONT & ONGOING	2 Others	dpt hds	There is no			dpt hds & tchrs	CRT trng not cur-			provided		withn district
17	2 INFORMAL "ON THE JOB(CRT)"		2 Mentors	routinized trng				rently planned					
18	CONTENT OF TRAINING	1-2 Adm	1-2 adm,mis,	2			1-2 Adm/dpt	4 (Ach Cncl)	2	2	No frml trng	1-2-3-4	No frml trng
19	1 813 GENERAL	2 Others	dpt hds				hds/counselors				provided		withn district
20	2 813 TASK SPECIFIC	A-B-C-D-E	A-B-F-G	B	A-B-C-D-F-G		A-B-C-D-F-G		A-B-C-D	. . .		A-B-C-E-F-G-H	
21	A ALIGNMENT E GRAD REQ	Appears to be	Mst cur dev hs	Tchr requests	No mntn of trng		Insv cndctd to		CRT major focus		A	1 adm & tchr	
22	B TEXTBKS F COUNSELING	strong dist CR	bn codified,	to assist with	of CRTs guid		dev awrns of		has been on cur			2 CRT & Dept Ch	
23	C COURSE DEVLP G QUAL INDIC	effort w/little	impct at site lv	cur develp have	prov by dst/st		refs & impl str		develp as op-			3 SAC-Cncl prog	
24	D TESTING H PLANNING	attn to onging	vries	been politely	mgrs. Monit/		Dpt hds, tchr,		posed to on-			4 AB 551 prog	
25	3 MONITORING OR EVALUATION	site issues and	Ext use of CRTs	refused	eval in to site		supposed to wrk		going prog			AB 65	
26	4 OTHER	concerns					w/rest - didn't		management			AB 803	
27	TASKS OR AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY	1 Dist CRT	1-2-3	2		1-2		4 (Ach Cncl)	2	2-4	1-2	1-2-3-4	1-2
28	1 813 GENERAL		CRTs wrkd to		1-2	A	2			4 = SIP program	A,H		A-B-C-D-E-G
29	2 813 SPECIFIC	A-B-C-D	dev impl strat	B	A-B-C-D-F-G		A-B-C-D-F-G		A-B-C	A-B-C-(Mentor)		A-B-C-E-F-G-H	CRTs emplyd
30	A ALIGNMENT E GRAD REQ		site respblty		Site mgr mngs		w/ blncd CRTs		Prin consults	Dec reached via		3 SAC-Cncl prog	in dev impl
31	B TEXTBKS F COUNSELING		rests prim w/	Most cur devel	tchr orient to		wrkd on cmpnts		with staff in	consensus &		4 AB 551 prog	strategies
32	C CURR DEVELP G QUAL INDIC		dept heads	is done by ctrl	reforms		cist to staff		on informal	accepted by CO		AB 65	
33	D TESTING H PLANNING			office cur spec	dpt hds				CRT on all re-	as consistent		AB 803	
34	3 MONITORING OR EVALUATION			w/out tchr or					form issues &	w/ schl goals			
35	4 OTHER			CRT assistance					cur changes				
36	COMMENTS RE CROSS ROLE TEAMS	CRT asst w/	Elaborate vary	Tchrs do not	CRTS prioritized	No genuine CRTs	CRTs wrkd eff	Dist & schl are	CRT's worked	Dist gives CRT	CRTS vry lmtd	CRT's have work	Sml sch sz mks
37		site acceptance	of Crs/tle tms	feel a part of	are dis 5.	exist at EB HS	in dev impl pln	in 1st yr of schl	effectively to	release time	& nw cncpt to	ed to centralize	CRTs almst un-
38		of reform		the dec making	goals/refs intg		Centr/2 impl pl	reform effort	get tchr buy-in		this district	and legit'z refor	necessary
39	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	CENTRALIZED	DECENTRALIZED	CENTRALIZED	2/centralized		cnsistd of rec	YES	CENTRALIZED	DECENTRALIZED	NO PLAN	1	NO PLAN
40	SCOPE OF PLAN	2	1	2 Dist plan less		2/centrlzd site	of supt drctns	1 (Initial Plan)	2 Lesson Design	2: Gen dist plan	Press exists at	Dist plan estab-	Sm sz restricts
41	1 DISTRICT AND SITE PLANS	Plan impl was	impl at site	restrictive for	Impl pln at spc	impl assrd by	regrd site impl		1 Site adds to	1: Written site	other co or site	lishes timeline &	need for pln
42	2 SINGLE DISTRICT-WIDE PLAN	highly central	assgnd to dp hds	HS's than JH's	813 related	clsly coupld dist			dist plan spec	plan (SIP) used		minimum requir	
43	3 SITE PLAN ONLY	ized		813 "not a prog"		effort			obj & activit's	to manage chng		ments	
44	NATURE OF PLAN	1 Dist plan	1 Dst wrtn pln	1 Dist plan	Dist pln is wrtn	1 Dist pln not		2 Plan is still in	1: Dist highly	1 (SIP)	No formal reform	1	
45	1 WRITTEN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	contains de-	at adjusted site	No site plan		written		the development-	structured &	Dist plan outlines	pln, few admin	Site plan specifies	
46	A ACTIVITIES D ROLES	tailed imple-	plns addrs all	Reform seen as	Site pln is not	2 Site pln is		al stage	closely moni-	support system	are tightening up	who will do what	
47	B STRATEGIES E FUNCTIONS	mentation &	areas, bt impl	ongoing ex-	written	written ISPP		The district plan	tored by dist	for schls choos-	mentor, MCS,	when and how	
48	C ROLES F EVAL DESIGN	monitoring	rsts prim w/hd	pected part of				will be very	and principal	ing to implement	textbooks	Site plan is 551	
49	2 WRITTEN GENERAL GUIDELINES	strategies		the profession				comprhen'v and		reform effort		based and sup-	
50	3 TASK STRATEGIES ONLY	No site plan		813 "not a prog"				tightly monitored				ported by Cnl	
51	PROGRAM MANAGER	1 CO Adm's	1 Co admins	2 Prin & dept	1 Co adms	Co adms	1 Co adms	1 & 2	1 & 2 (Site P	2 Prin, AP, &	1. Co adms	1-2 Designated	1/2 supt
52	1 DISTRICT 2 SITE	2 Prin, AP &	2 Dept hds	chrs mng the	2 Princ	2 site-prin	2 Princ	Site management	and dist spec	Dept Chrs	2 Prin site	dist and site adm	1/2 princ
53		Dept Chrs		reform effort	3 Tchr/dpt hds		3 Dpt hds/tchrs	is Ach Cncl & P	play sig role)			oversee plan	
54	COMMENTS RE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	Dist site linkage	Dist/site lnkge	Dist-site linkage	Tght dist schl	Dist initiates		Dist-site linkage	Dist-site linkage	Dist-site linkage	Pln not devel	Dist-site linkage	Crts are not
55		is loosely cpld	loosely coupld	has min feedbk	linkage	plns - wrtn at		is tightly cpld	is tightly cpld	is loosely cpld		is loosely cpld	signicnt
56													
57													
58	OVERALL CROSS ROLE TEAMING	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	site LOW	HIGH	LOW MOD	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	LOW
59	OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	LOW MOD	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	LOW
60	OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW MOD	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
61													
62	CAUSAL FACTOR G. IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT		DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS AND ROUND 2 CASE STUDIES										
63													
64													
65													

TABLE G2 B CAUSAL FACTOR G IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1			BIG CITY		MEDIUM DISTRICTS										
2			(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)		(36,393 - 15,132)										
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS	East Bay MS	LA Metro MS									
4	CROSS ROLE TEAMING	YES	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES/HIGH									
5	TEAM MEMBERSHIP	1-2-3-5	1-2-3-4-5-6-7	1-2-5	1-2-3-6-8-10	1-2-3-5									
6	1 CENTRAL OFFICE 6 COUNSELORS	Two CRT's	8-10	Dist CRT used in	Site CRT mngs	CRT's formed									
7	2 PRIN OR V PRIN 7 CONSULTANTS	Dist CRT's for	Mny CRTs estd	txtbk selectn	impl pln also	each time curr									
8	3 DEPT CHAIRS 8 COMMUNITY	813 reform &	to dev impl plns	Ad hoc task	SIP couns incldg	change occurred									
9	4 MENTORS 9 STUDENTS	site level CRT	fr all aspcts of	forces estab-	parents	to work during									
10	5 TEACHERS 10 OTHERS	for 551 tasks	curr/813 refs	lished by supt		summer									
11	LEVEL OF OPERATIONS	1 & 2	1-2-3	1	3	1									
12	1 DISTRICT TEAM	Two separate		Schl has SAC		Dist level CRT's									
13	2 DISTRICT-SITE TEAM	teams dist &		which develps		shifted site level									
14	3 SITE TEAM	site specific		gen SI plan		implementat'n									
15	TYPE OF TRAINING	1 Adm	1 Adm, mts, hds	2	No spec trng	2									
16	1 FORMAL-UPFRONT & ONGOING	2 Others	2 Mentors	There is no	provided										
17	2 INFORMAL-"ON THE JOB(CRT)"			routinized trng											
18	CONTENT OF TRAINING	1-2 Adm	1-2 Adm, mt,	2		2									
19	1 813 GENERAL	2 Others	dpt hds												
20	2 813 TASK SPECIFIC	A-B-C-D-E	A-B-D-F-G-H	B		A-B-C-D									
21	A ALIGNMENT E GRAD REQ	Appears to be	Dpt hds tk lg rl	Tchr requests		Major focus									
22	B TEXTBKS F COUNSELING	strong dist CRT	in orienting dpt	to assist with		has been on cur									
23	C COURSE DEVLP G QUAL INDIC	effort w/little	members	cur develp have		develp as op-									
24	D TESTING H PLANNING	attn to onging		been politely		posed to on-									
25	3 MONITORING OR EVALUATION	site issues and		refused		going prog									
26	4 OTHER	concerns				management									
27	TASKS OR AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY	1 Dist CRT	1-2-3	2	1-2	2									
28	1 813 GENERAL	2 Site CRT	CRTs wrkd to		Dist & site lev										
29	2 813 SPECIFIC	A-B-C-D	dev impl strat	B	comm wrk at	A-B-C									
30	A ALIGNMENT D GRAD REQ	4 CRT set up	site respon role		implm all										
31	B TEXTBKS E COUNSELING	to asst with	prin w/dp hds	Most cur devel	reform compone										
32	C CURR DEVELP F QUAL INDIC	changing from		is done by dist											
33	D TESTING G PLANNING	junior high to		office cur spec											
34	3 MONITORING OR EVALUATION	middle school		w/ovl tchr or											
35	4 OTHER			CRT assistance											
36	COMMENTS RE CROSS ROLE TEAMS	CRT asst w/	Liberal variety	Tchrs & site	CRTs main	CRT's worked									
37		site acceptance	of CRTS	prin do not feel	priority are	effectively to									
38		of reform		part of dec mkg	district goals	get tchr buy-in									
39	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	CENTRALIZED	DECENTRALIZED	CENTRALIZED	CENTRALIZED	CENTRALIZED									
40	SCOPE OF PLAN	2	1	2 Dist AGP plan	CENTRALIZED	2 Lesson Design									
41	1 DISTRICT AND SITE PLANS	Plan impl was	impl at site span	There is no site	Site impl coord	1 Site adds to									
42	2 SINGLE DISTRICT-WIDE PLAN	highly central	to dp hds/tchrs and	plan per se	by [illegible]	dist plan spec									
43	3 SITE PLAN ONLY	ized	prin	813 "not a prog	dist all 2 Site	obj & activit's									
44	NATURE OF PLAN	1 Dist plan	1 Dist wrtn pln	1 Dist plan	pln wrtn 1SPP	1 Dist highly									
45	1 WRITTEN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	The site 551	not adptd site	1 Dist AGP plan		structured &									
46	A ACTIVITIES D ROLES	plan was task	impl pln fr tll	reform as an		closely moni-									
47	B STRATEGIES E FUNCTIONS	specific & not	ref not estab	ongoing, ex-		tored by dist									
48	C ROLES F EVAL DESIGN	a gen guide for	has exc SIP pln	pected part of		and principal									
49	2 WRITTEN GENERAL GUIDELINES	813 reforms		the profession											
50	3 TASK STRATEGIES ONLY														
51	PROGRAM MANAGER	1 CO adm	1 Co ordntrs	2 Prin & dept		1 & 2 (Site P									
52	1 DISTRICT 2 SITE	2 Prin, Site	2 Dept hds	chrs mng the		and res tchrs									
53		CRT mng 551		reform effort		play sig role)									
54	COMMENTS RE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	Dist site linkage	Dist/site linkge	Dist site linkage	Dist initiates	Dist site linkage									
55		is loosely cpld	tely coupled	has min feedbk	site pln wrtn	is highly cpld									
56	OVERALL CROSS ROLE TEAMING	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	HIGH									
57	OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH									
58	OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT	LOW MOD	HIGH	LOW	LOW	HIGH									
59	DECISION RULES														
60	OVERALL HIGH Strong evidence of presence of critical components at both district and site level														
61	OVERALL MOD Evidence of presence of critical components at either district or site level and not both														
62	Evidence of more than half of the critical elements but not all of them at either the district or site														
63	OVERALL LOW Evidence of presence of less than half of the critical components at district or site level														
64	YES Data supported presence of component or item														
65	NO Data did not support presence of the component or item														
66	-- Data not available to the degree necessary to assign value to component or item														
67	LIMITED Data supports minimal level of presence														
68															
69	DATA SOURCE CAUSAL FACTOR SHEET AND ROUND 2 CASE STUDIES														

TABLE G3A CAUSAL FACTOR H: INITIAL CONTENT, SKILL, AWARENESS TRAINING

1	1	2	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17
2			BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS	
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	(ADA:	848,500 - 44,016)		(ADA: 28,282 - 20,850)				(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)			(ADA: 18,341 - 182)	
4	AWARENESS/SKILL TRAINING	Capital City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
5	ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES		DATA N/S	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES
6	CROSS ROLE TEAMING	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/			YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES
7	INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP	YES/...	YES/YES	YES/YES (SIP)	NO/NO	NO/NO			NO/NO	YES/YES (SIP)	YES/YES	YES/LIMITED	NO/NO
8	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	YES/NO	YES/YES	.../...	YES/YES	NO/NO	YES/YES		YES/YES	...	YES/YES	.../...	YES/YES
9	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES		YES/YES	YES/YES	NO/NO	YES/YES	YES/YES
10	SCHL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS	NO/NO	NO/NO	.../...	NO/NO	NO/NO	YES/..		YES/NO	WASC/SIP revw	NO/NO	.../...	NO/NO
11	SB 813 (SPECIFY)	NO/NO	NO/NO	YES/YES (SIP)	NO/NO	NO/NO	YES/YES		NO/NO	YES/YES (SIP)	NO/NO	.../...	NO/NO
12		Adm Overview	Prin Rec'd	Principals focus	Skill trng hs no	Some site adm	Wkshps hld		CAP Improvm	Adm training re	All adm trng	Tchr eval/cert	Princ at wrkshp
13		5 dy Clncl Supv	Awrness trg	in campus envi	dir link to	attend sessns	fr prin, dpt.		Lesson Design	Madeline Hunter	thn voln otside	traing attended	at cnty or lcl
14		trng for Tchr	from cent off,	ronment and	SB 813 awrns	at county off	hds, tchrs on		Clncl Supervn	suprv/tching	of dist by VP	by all adm & put	state univ
15		eval/certificatn	cln supv	student disc	of reform		CRTs to trn		Strong dist	model; Has not		into practice	
16		P. use of tchr		Tchrs delegated			other teachers		pressure to	had major im-		ATC used by adm	Served on WASC
17		eval effected		responsibility					implemt dist	pact on adm		Prior to SB 813	accred
18	OTHER (SPECIFY)	tchrs positively		of curr & instr					cur & model	practices		no standard trng	
19		...		Tchr eval: little			Inst. spec		...	WASC/SIP revw		Dist adm traing	
20	TEACHER AWARNESS/SKILLTRAING			impact on tchg			w/cnty off to					program is plan'd	
21	CROSS ROLE TEAMING	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	NO/NO	YES/YES	gt mr stf dev		YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES
22	MENTORING	LIMITED/...	YES/LIMITED	YES/YES (SIP)	YES/NO	NO/NO	YES(LIMITED)		YES/LIMITED	YES/LIMITED	YES/YES	YES/LIMITED	NO/NO
23	CURRICULUM CONTENT	NO/NO	YES/LIMITED	.../...	NO/NO	NO/NO	YES/YES		(NO MTP)	YES/LIMITED	NO/NO	YES/YES	NO/NO
24	EFFECTIVE TEACHING	LIMITED/NO	YES/LIMITED	Textbk Publishr	NO/NO	YES/YES	YES/YES		YES/YES	YES/LIMITED	YES/NO	YES/LIMITED	YES/YES
25	CONTENT SPECIFIC PEDAGOGY	NO/NO	YES/LIMITED	Clinical Tchg	YES/YES	YES/YES	NO/NO		YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/LYES	YES/YES	YES/YES
26	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	LIMITED/NO	YES/YES	W'g Across Cu	NO/NO	YES/YES	NO/NO		YES/NO	.../...	NO/NO	YES/LIMITED	YES/YES
27	SB 813 (SPECIFY)	.../...	NO/NO	.../...	NO/NO	YES/YES	NO/NO		YES/YES	.../...	NO/NO	.../...	NO/NO
28		Rely on P/dept	All tchrs recd	SB 813 did not	Tchrs rec keys	awrnss/skill	Mis traind &		CAP Improvm	MCS course cont	MCS comp cmplt	MCS-textbk-test	Stf dev held at
29		chr for curr &	trg in QSBII	require new	trng no trng fr	trg vry infrml	tchrs exprsd		Lesson Design	alignment trng	at site. KMrshl	course alignment	cnty off or other
30	OTHER (SPECIFY)	textbk training	But little flwup	skills for tchrs	entire faculty	ABSS/fndng	no. Dn't wish		813 cur chng	Counseling prog	stf dev prg pshd	& implementat'n	sites. Not dist
31		Dist training is	Dept hds/mts	District offers		for use of cmp	to go after sch		Schl's focus is	training	by mentor tchrs	Dist staff develp	or school
32		offered on a	rec'd trng	inservice re:					on discipline	Integrated skills		program based on	
33		voluntary basis		new cur guides					& new 813	in the classrm		annual needs as-	
34		Tchrs do not		developed by					cur changes	Trng re: Hunter		sessment	
35	TRAINING CYCLES	support MTP		central office						teaching model		AB 551, 803, 65	
36	SEQUENTIALLY SCHEDULED	YES	YES	YES (SIP Plan)			NO		YES	YES	YES/YES	YES	NO/NO
37	ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING	YES	YES	YES (SIP plan)	YES	NO	NO		YES	YES	YES/YES	YES (AB 551)	NO/NO
38	TEACHER TRAINING	1-5d session	YES	NO	YES	NO			4d-Y sessions	...	YES/NO	5 Ds w/followup	NO/NO
39	PLANS FOR COACHING/FOLLOW UP		YES	YES (SIP plan)	NO	NO			Substantial	2 Inservice days	YES/YES	3 prsrvc; 1 insrv	NO/NO
40	ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES		YES/YES	...	NO/NO	YES	NO/NO
41	TEACHER TRAINING	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES		YES	...	NO/NO	YES	NO.NO
42		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES		YES	1-1.5hr/mth	NO/NO	Varies; Some yes	NO/NO
43	COMMENTS										Mnml trg for	Collborative asst	Prin prtcpts in &
44		Prior to SB 813	Trg fr princ	Trng included:	No trng fr ent	Mgt trng done	Provision md		Substantial	Staff developmt	adm/tchr stff	The school states	supps tch att at
45		there was little	in awrns. Dept	CAI, writing &	fac in awrnss	at dist level. No	fr follow-up		traing re:	includes:	dev. psh comes	that staff develp	wrkshp and confs
46		staff developmt	hds/mts have	basic skills	hrs trng avl to	org struct to	cch/trng. Tchr		CAP Improvmt	Effectv Schls	frm mts & new	drives reform	Dist too smll to
47		Tchrs positive	recd trg. All	Subject area	all fac/stf. No	prvde awrnss	would go stir		& Lsn Dsgn	Mastery Tchg	curr spec	process	sponsor
48		about dist trng	tchrs QSB II	content traing	flwup. Ten prv	skills trng	school		for adm/tchr	TESA		Staff develp is	
49		Tchrs asking	but no fllwup	provided by	as gen. rule				Future focus:	SIP Prog Revw		assisted by spec	
50		for more	Tchrs need skl	textbk publishr					HOTS, Wrtg,	Cooperatv Lrng		grants: 551, 65,	
51		$ is a problem	awrnss/skill	Dist offers a					& application	SCWrP		803, Comp Ed, &	
52		No new trng set	trng.	variety of vol-					HOTS current-	and others.		dist program	
53		up; Use existing		untary inservc					ly has low	TECC used for		Mentors provide	
54		mechanisms		classes					priority	computer trng		training to tchrs	
55	OVERALL ASSESSMENT ADM TRAINING	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE
56	OVERALL ASSESSMENT TCHR TRAINING	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE
57	DECISION RULES:												
58													
59													
60													
61													
62	CAUSAL FACTOR H: INITIAL CONTENT, SKILL, AND AWARENESS TRAINING			DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS AND ROUND 2 CASE STUDIES									
63													
64													
65													

TABLE G3B CAUSAL FACTOR H: INITIAL CONTENT, SKILL, AND AWARENESS TRAINING

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1			BIG CITY		MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
2		(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)			(ADA: 30,393 - 15,132)									
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS	East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
4	AWARENESS/SKILL TRAINING	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES								
5	ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES								
6	CROSS ROLE TEAMING	YES/- - -	YES/YES	NO/NO	NO/NO	NO/NO								
7	INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP	YES/NO	YES/YES	- - - / - - -	NO/NO	YES/YES								
8	CLINICAL SUPERVISION	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES	YES/YES								
9	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	NO/NO	YES/YES	- - - / - - -	NO/NO	YES/NO								
10	SCHL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS	NO/NO	YES/YES	- - - / - - -	NO/NO	YES/NO								
11	SB 813 (SPECIFY)	Adm Overview	Area tque princ	Clinical Superv	Awrnss cme	CAP Improvm								
12		& dy Cincl Supv	prvd trng &	is viewed as a	thru partic. in	Lesson Design								
13		trng for Tchr	subg for imple	requirement &	sch plan, dist	Cincl Supervn								
14		eval/certificn		not as means	curr comm &	Strong dist								
15		Tchr eval trng		for ongoing	dist. inst	pressure to								
16		had no effect		instructional		implemt dist								
17		on tchg staff		improvement		cur & model								
18	OTHER (SPECIFY)	- - -		- - -		- - -								
19														
20	TEACHER AWARNESS/SKILL TRAING	YES/YES	YES/YES		YES/YES	YES/YES								
21	CROSS ROLE TEAMING	YES/- - -	YES/YES	NO (limited use)	YES/YES	YES/LIMITED								
22	MENTORING	YES/- - -	YES/YES	- - - / - - -	YES/YES	(NO MTP)								
23	CURRICULUM CONTENT	LIMITED/NO	YES/YES	Textbk Publishr	YES/YES	YES/YES								
24	EFFECTIVE TEACHING	NO/NO	YES/YES	Clinical Tchg	YES/YES	YES/YES								
25	CONTENT SPECIFIC PEDAGOGY	LIMITED/ NO	YES/YES	R/WAcross Cur	YES/YES	YES/YES								
26	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	YES/YES	YES/YES	- - - / - - -	YES/YES	YES/YES								
27	SB 813 (SPECIFY)	MCS & CAP		Cur would have	Stff dev is	CAP Improvm								
28		District offered		looked same	available for	Lesson Design								
29		tchrs wrkshps		w/out SB 813	those who	813 cur chng								
30	OTHER (SPECIFY)	AB 551		Dist traing is	choose to prtic	Assertive Disc								
31		Clsrm Mgt		offered on a		trng (Cantor)								
32		Schl Climate		voluntary basis		Warm climate								
33		Discipline prog		re: cur guides		& collegiality								
34		HOTS												
35	TRAINING CYCLES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES								
36	SEQUENCIALLY SCHEDULED	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES								
37	ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING	1.5d session	YES	NO	NO	4 day sessions								
38	TEACHER TRAINING	2-1/2d session	YES	NO	NO	"Substantial"								
39	PLANS FOR COACHING/FOLLOW UP	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES/YES								
40	ADMINISRATOR TRAINING	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES								
41	TEACHER TRAINING	NO	LIMITED	NO	NO	YES								
42														
43	COMMENTS:	Prior to SB 813	Stff dev admn	Dist offers no	Excpt fr clss	Substantial								
44		there was little	is strng wthn	routinized prog	mgmt. tchr pck	traing re:								
45		staff developmt	the dist tchrs	for staff traing	and choose	CAP Improvmt								
46		Tchrs positive	seek asst. frm	Subject area	what they wish	& Lsn Dsgn								
47		about dist trng	outside orgs	content traing	to take	for adm/tchr								
48		Tchrs asking		provided by		Future focus:								
49		for more		textbk publishr		HOTS, Writg,								
50		& is a problem				& application								
51	OVERALL ASSESSMENT ADM TRAINING	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH								
52	OVERALL ASSESSMENT TCHR TRAINING	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH								
53														
54	DECISION RULES.													
55														
56														
57	CAUSAL FACTOR H: INITIAL CONTENT, SKILL, AND AWARENESS TRAINING				DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS AND ROUND 2 CASE STUDIES									
58														
59														
60														
61														
62														
63														
64														
65														

TABLE G4A CAUSAL FACTOR J CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CHANGE, AND ALIGNMENT

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17
1			BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS	
2			(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)		(ADA 36,393 - 30850)				(ADA 15,132 - 14,081)			(ADA 18,341 - 182)	
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capital City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
4	EVIDENCE OF CURR DEVELOPMENT	YES	YES-grd rq lng	YES	YES	YES	YES cur bng aln	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
5		Dist reform is	sch yr, MCS nw	Focus at HS is	cur alng w/MCS	MCS align cur	w/MCS/txtbks	813 reinforced	Algnmt w/MCS	MCS used as guide	No evid of site	MCS used as guide	Rgr of curr
6		curr centered	late, Prir inst pg	raising standards	MT, lngr sch yr		grd req incrsd	dist 's prior goal	CAP, no AP	to revise courses	or dist ldrshp	to align cur & inst	cntnt mch strgr
7	SUBJECT AREA CONTENT	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3-4-5-6	1-2-3-4-5	2	1-2-3	1-2-3	1-2-3-5-6	1-2-3-4	1-2-3-4		1-2-3-4-5-6	1-2-3-4-6
8	1 MATH 5 TESTS	No significant	MCS, gs	HS have more lat	Strngnt grd req	all crse outlns	ap cls in sci/eng	6=For Language	Bsc stud	Course offering	English	Increased CP & AP	Incrsd rigor
9	2 SCIENCE 6 ESL	change in pre-		itude than elem to	in plc bfr 813	rewrtn along	ESL algnd	Added AP, Math		& grad req ex-	Science	Increased cur rigor	acrs curr
10	3 ENGLISH 7 OTHER	pupil 813		making changes &	3rd yr Sci be	with 813	w/instrctl core	Sci, waiting for		ceed state stand's		Increased Spec Pop	testing strngth
11	4 SOC SCI	course offerngs		develp local curr	not			dist on Soc Sci		Voc ed & elect cuts		access to core curr	
12	NATURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT	QUANTITY CHNG	QUAN & QUAL	QUAN&QUALITY	QUAL (LIMITED)	QUAL & QUAN	QUAN & QUAL	QUANTITY	QUAN&QUALITY	QUANTITY	QUAL		QUALITY
13		Increase in #		Uniform core curr			813 increased	813 increased	CAP has driven	813 fit well with		AB 551 & staff	
14		of sections		adapted by tchr			stf & crses	staff & courses	content quality	current SIP prog		develp drove chng	
15	ACROSS CONTENT AREAS	1&3/LIMITED	1-3	1&3/LIMITED	4	1-4	3	1&3	3	4(Integrated Skills)	1	1-2-3	NO SPECIFICS
16	1 R/WRITING ACROSS CURR		RW beg impl	SIP program offer	AP cls add in	crse gd rfkts	wkshps cndcted	Improving CAP		CAP was not a	effrt to dev r/w	CAP was adm focus	
17	2 ESL UNIT/COURSE DEVELOPMT			asst to LEP&SCE	Eng/Adv For	eff to crit think	on imprvng CAP	scores is a		driving force for	across curr	less of a tchr focus	
18	3 CAP PREPARATION	CAP is schl &	CAP beg impl	students via	Lang	r/w acrs cur	scores	major focus &		curr developm't		Integrative courses	
19	4 OTHER	not dist focus		wrtn across curr		& cont bsd rdg		eval measure				were devloped	
20	EVIDENCE OF QUALITATIVE CHANGE	YES/LIMITED	YES (LIMITED)	YES/LIMITED	YES/VERY LIM	YES/LIMITED	YES (LIMITED)	YES/LIMITED	YES/LIMITED	YES/LIMITED	NO	YES/LIMITED	
21	NATURE OF CHANGE	2/LIMITED	1-2-3 4 Prim Im	1-2-3-4	1-2-3-4	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3	1&5 (CAP)	1	1-2-3		1-2-3-4-5	1-2
22	1 CONTENT DEPTH AND COMPLEXITY	Dist recently	to SIP Inded math	Funding, textbks,	Sme chng Instd	Vrys considrbly	in AP cls	Dist Dir of Testg	All tracks	Fall inservice	Content/Books	5=labs/hands on	curr percd as
23	2 ANALYTICAL & CRITICAL THINKING	hired HS curr	lab	and time given	in Soc Stud/For	frm clsrm to	specifically	conducting trng	upgraded	dedicated to inte		HOTS workshops	more cmplx
24	3 HIGHER ORDER THINKING SKILLS	coordinator		as main reason	Lang	clsrm		to asst tchrs in		grating skills that		held for tchrs	intro HOTS
25	4 PROBLEM SOLVING	Inadequate $		for not making				preparing stdnts		included thinking		Math & sci courses	
26	5 OTHER	is main issue		more changes				for CAP test		skills		enriched& extended	
27	EVIDENCE OF CURR ALIGNMENT	YES/STRONG	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES/STRONG	YES
28	TYPE AND EXTENT	1-2-3-4-6	1-2-3-4	1-2-3-4-limited 5	1-2-3	1-2-3-4	1-2-3	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3-4-5	1-2-3-4-other HS	1-2	1-2-3-4-5	1-2
29	1 MCS 4 TESTS	6=Grad Req	MCS & vrs guide	State frameworks	MCS, crse gd	Alignment going	MCS/CRS of	Schl & dist in		Dist cur develp	Sme eff mde to	Dist implemented	MCS & crs
30	2 CRS OF STDY 5 SPECIAL POPS	No special con-	compar	were also aligned	comp, CAP test	on for years	stdy aligned/	1st yr of a long		is aligned with	algn MCS/CRS	5yr plan for curr	outlines aligned
31	3 TEXTBOOKS 6 OTHER	siderations for	CAP tsts prep	Dist curr guides	prep		tests	term C&I imprv		state's 7yr text-	outline	development that	
32		Spec Pop's		are aligned but				effort		book select'n cycle		used CRT's	
33	NATURE OF CURR CHANGE PROCESS	DIST TOP DOWN	DIST TOP DOWN	MIXED (UP DWN)	TP/DN BTM/UP	TP DOWN	TOP DOWN	DIST TOP DWN	TOP DOWN	MIDDLE OUT	BOTTOM UP	MIDDLE OUT	TOP DOWN
34	EVIDENCE OF PLANNED CHANGE	YES (Dist Plan)	YES	YES (Dist Plan)	YES	YES (dist pln)	YES (dist pln)	YES	YES	YES	YES (LIMITED)	YES	YES
35	INCREASED CENTRALIZATION	YES	YES	LESS TOP DOWN	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES (LIMITED)	NO	YES	NO
36	INCREASED UNIFORMITY	YES	YES	LESS MANDATED	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
37	INCREASED ARTICULATION	YES (Elem&CC)		NO CHANGE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES (LIMITED)	YES	YES
38	EVIDENCE OF RELATED STAFF DEV	NO	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES(SIP emphasis)	NO	YES (AB 551)	YES
39	UP FRONT TRAINING	Staff Dev is	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
40	ONGOING TRAINING & FOLLOWUP	the #1 concern	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES/LIMITED	NO
41	IDENTIFY KEY ACTORS IN CHANGE	HS Cur Coord,	Cons dpt hds	Formal dist spec	Vs/dist level	Dist /site crs		Line staff, AC,	Dist, princ	Pr, AP, Dpt Chr,	Curr spec	Asst Supt, Asst P	Princ/Supt
42		Dpt Ch, & CRT		Actual tchr	site adm/tchr	role teams		Mentors		CO staff, CRT's		Coord's, Dept Chrs	
43	RATIONALE FOR CURR CHANGE	1 and 2	3	2 PRIMARILY				3(+dist 813 fa)	3	3- 813 was rolled	1	3 (813 Major Drive)	3
44	1 SB 813 RELATED 3 COMBINATION	Recent central	Pre 813 curr chg	Dist has had an	3	3	3	Packard grant		into a district	ref still in	Schl & dist used	curr chng bugn
45	2 PRE 813 ONGOING 4 OTHER	izat'n movem't	Incorp in 813	ongoing cur chng		curr ref bgn bfr	grd req incr in	used like SIP		initiated effort	erliest phase of	813 as vehicle to	w/arr of nw
46		Pre 813 curr	effort	effort for 10yrs		813/rec impetus	82 in anticpation	to asst w/ chng		to upgrade & un-	implementation	upgrade & guide	prn/supt 1980
47		dev was ex-		Core cur not fully		from H	of SB 813	process		ify curr/textbks		cur & instruction	impls frm SB
48		panded and in		implemented				813 cur focus is		Supt saw schls as		improvement	813
49		corprated 813		Dist leaves curr	Whl dist has imp	Mjr diff is amt	Tp dwn impl	aligned with dist		the 813 target			
50	COMMENTS	Dist has long	Dist adptd pre	guides to be used	all comps at	of st dev avlble	hindured becse	Extensive tchr	Upgrade all	Supt w/ Asst Sup	No curr ldrshp	Dist Coord and Re-	Sml size results
51		history of un-	813 curr chng	by tchrs with	dist level, site	to tchrs in frm	no ongng asst	involvement in	tracks, add	established early	frm dist/site	source tchrs were	in cls coup of af
52		structured &	prpsl 813 mndte	mixed results	adm/tch have	of ongoing asst	to teachers	CAP skills&dist	AP	comprehensive	compliance	used to asst w/ cu	Stff dev prov
53		decentralized	adopted	Dist approved	impl only limited			curr changes		813 plan-Schls	perfunct	devel	by send adm/
54		cur decision		courses/textbks	way			Supt had personal		had option to buy		Mentors were not	tchr to othr
55		making, recent		and monitored by				commitment to		into 813 reforms		used for curr	
56		positive change		proficiency testg				improving schl		Tri-Cnty HS didl		development	
57	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF CURR DEV	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
58	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF QUAL CHANGE	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	LOW-MOD	MODERATE
59	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ALIGNMENT	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
60													
61	CAUSAL FACTOR J CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CHANGE, AND ALIGNMENT			DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS AND CASE STUDIES									
62													
63													
64													
65													

TABLE G4 B CAUSAL FACTOR J: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CHANGE, AND ALIGNMENT

	1	2	3	4		6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1			BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
2		(ADA	846,500 ·	44,014)		(ADA: 38,393 · 14,091)									
3	MAJOR AND SUBCOMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
4	EVIDENCE OF CURR DEVELOPMENT	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES								
5		Dist ref is	nw dist grd	Crs order &		nw crs otlns									
6		curr centered	sl	AGP prgm dv											
7	SUBJECT AREA CONTENT	1·2·3·4	1·2·3·6	1·2·3·4·5·6		1·2·3·4·6	1·2·3·4·6								
8	1. MATH 4. TESTS	Sch gally rp	Incred rqr	6-Fr Lang		crs otlns	w. civ.								
9	2. SCIENCE 5. ESL	chnge asign	(adv cls in	Added avia,		wrtn bef MCS									
10	3. ENGLISH 6. OTHER	mth adjsn : mth	all areas)	Sci, Econ, Gg		mr rig thn									
11		too easy		Prob & Stat		MCS/rec dst									
12	NATURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT	QUAN CHANG		QUAN & QUAL		chng to MAT	QUAN & QUAL								
13		Sci & Soc Sci		Txbk inflncs		Dst curr dir/									
14		rquird 1 fldng		crrnt qual		dpt chrs, sce									
15	ACROSS CONTENT AREAS	1&3 LIMITED	1·3	1 & 3		5	1·3								
16	1. R/WRITING ACROSS CURR	CAP vs schl &	R/W acrs curr	CAP an imprt		as sch dev	R/W across								
17	2. ESL UNIT/COURSE DEVELPMNT	not dist focus	hs bn inte-	initi; not		indv sch perf	curr. hlps w/								
18	3. CAP PREPARATION	P. met w/each	grated into	tchr reaction		pln on basis	8th grde								
19	4. OTHER	tchr re CAP	curriculum			of need id on	CAP								
20						CAP									
21	EVIDENCE OF QUALITATIVE CHANGE	YES LIMITED	YES	YES LIMITED		YES	YES								
22	NATURE OF CHANGE	1·2 LIMITED	1·2·3·4	1·2·3·4		1·5	1·5								
23	1. CONTENT DEPTH AND COMPLEXITY	P. encrge tchrs	Incred enrlmt	$, txtbks, &		mre cmplx	Upgrade across								
24	2. ANALYTICAL & CRITICAL THINKING	to attnd dist	in dmnd	tme gvn as		cont/mre	the board								
25	3. HIGHER ORDER THINKING SKILLS	HOTS trng	classes	mn reason for		emph on acad									
26	4. PROBLEM SOLVING	Inadequate $		nt mking more											
27	5. OTHER	is main issue		changes											
28	EVIDENCE OF CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT	YES STRONG	YES MOD	YES		YES	YES								
29	TYPE AND EXTENT	1·2·3·4·6	2	1·2·3·4		1·2·4·5	1·2·3·4·5								
30	1. MCS 4. TESTS	6-St Framewrk	sch uses curr	Tchrs plsd w/		Sp pops nt									
31	2. CRS OF STDY 5. SPECIAL POPS	Tchrs suportve	ref against	nw txtbks &		served well									
32	3. TEXTBOOKS 6. OTHER	Mjr focus on	MCS	use gds to											
33		frmwork & CAP		vrying degs											
34	NATURE OF CURRICULUM CHANGE PROCESS	DIST-TOP DOWN	TOP DOWN	DIST TOP DN		TOP DOWN	TOP DOWN								
35	EVIDENCE OF PLANNED CHANGE	YES (dist plan)	YES	YES (Dist Pln)		YES	YES								
36	INCREASED CENTRALIZATION	YES	YES	NO CHANGE		YES	YES								
37	INCREASED UNIFORMITY	YES	YES	NO CHANGE		YES	YES								
38	INCREASED ARTICULATION	YES (HS)	YES	NO CHANGE		YES	YES								
39	EVIDENCE OF RELATED STAFF DEVLPMNT	NO	YES	YES/LIMITED		YES	YES								
40	UP FRONT TRAINING	Stf dev #1	YES	YES/LIMITED		YES	YES								
41	ONGOING TRAINING & FOLLOW UP	cncrn	YES	NO		YES	Dst princp								
42	IDENTIFY KEY ACTORS IN CHANGE	Dpt Chr, tchr	YES - LIMITED	Dst cur spec/		curr dir dpt	ste. res.								
43		& CAT	dpt hds/prin	no teachers		hds	teachers								
44	RATIONALE FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE	1·2	3	2 - primarily		2									
45	1. SB 824 RELATED 3. COMBINATION	Rcnt cntrlztn	prin conc abt	Dist hs ongng		curr chng									
46	2. PRE 813 ONGOING 4. OTHER	mvemnt, pre 81	sch image	cur chng eff		prim acad									
47		curr dev was	primary	for 10 yrs		relng not on									
48		expnded & in-	motivation	Incred rigor		HOTS									
49		crprted 813		ongng for 5 y											
50															
51															
52	COMMENTS	Supt jst cmpltd	Sch has ongng	Dist issues		Vry sophist									
53		7 yr curr dev	trad for chng	curr gds for		pln & proc									
54		pln invlvng tchrs	hve used 813	tchrs w/mix		fr impl curr									
55		& teach assist	reqs as	results		chng strng									
56		Rcnt chng frm	framework	2-3 yr prog		acad thrust									
57		JH to MS		re R/W acrs											
58				curriculum											
59	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF CURR DEV	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH		HIGH	HIGH								
60	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF QUAL CHANGE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW		MODERATE	HIGH								
61	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ALIGNMENT	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE		HIGH	HIGH								
62															
63	DECISION RULES:														
64															
65	DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS · ROUND 1 & 2 CASE STUDIES AND OUTCOME REPORTS														

TABLE G5 A CAUSAL FACTOR K1: ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT AND LEADERSHIP

1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17	18
		BIG CITY URBAN			LARGE DISTRICTS			MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL		
		(ADA: 848,500 - 44,014)			(ADA: 36,393 - 30,850)			(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)			(ADA: 18,341 - 182)		
MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co. HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	
EVIDENCE OF ADM COMMITMENT	YES Dist holds prin responsible to implementat'n	YES Dist commit evn acrs comp	YES Supt member of Carnegie Task Force	YES Stng adm com dist/site YES	YES Subs invlvmt at dist/site	YES Dist & site CRTs dev ref implm strat	DATA N/S	YES Core curr focus on CAP & Lesn Dsgn	YES Lrng environment Meeting staff & studnt needs	YES mentl degree	YES Supported CRT participation & decisions	YES supt/princ same/strng commit	
SYMBOLIC COMMITMENT	YES Prin is the primary dist tch linking agent	YES Definitely at symb level	YES Prin commited in general to the dist vision	strng symb commitment	YES Adm tkng ld in reform	YES Prin symb supprtd dist efforts		YES Dist. staff in schools often	YES Support of SIP program Shared dec mkg	YES P. realizes this is dist priority	YES Supported reform based grants for special programs	YES P. exerts pres hrd chnge	
EXHIBIT KNOWLEDGE OF PROGRAM	YES		...	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
APPEAR AT TRAINING SESSIONS	...		...	YES	YES	...		YES	...	YES	YES	YES	
ALLOCATE NECESSARY RESOURCES	NO Lack of adequate staff development		YES	YES	YES Dist cond trng/ p. supports	YES Bdgting & prty sett w/DHOS		YES Large level of funding for staff develp	YES	YES P. strng res. alloc skilled ch agent	YES Used a number of resources to ensure adequate $	YES P. enpris conf mind & shrng ideas	
INSIST ON PROGRAM CONTINUATION	...		...	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
TECHNICAL COMMITMENT	LIMITED Using tchr eval effectively Member of CRT re: curriculum		YES Dist created cur guides & ordered tchrs to use them	YES Supp largely technical	YES	YES Eval of tchrs CRT particip		YES Prin evaluation partially based on ed leadership	YES Presence of a climate supportive of change	YES P. effrts reflct dist commt	YES Participated in & conducted trning Provided prof & personal support	YES P. strngly commited to change	
GIVE DIRECT ASST TO TEACHERS	...	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	...	YES	YES	YES	
PARTICIPATE IN INITIAL TRAINING	...	NO	...	NO	NO	...		YES	...	YES	YES	YES	
PARTICIPATE IN ONGOING TRAINING	NO Dist didn't provide assistance to prin to aid implementat'n	NO	... P received clinical superv'n training	NO Admn attend own stf dev	NO wd variety of staff dev	YES (LIMITED)		YES Training in effect'v tchg & clincial supervision	...	YES deleg to asst princ	YES Ongoing training was limited and tended to be ad hoc in nature	YES Sml sch size supp sharing	
BUDGET FUNDING FOR CONTINUATION	NO Lack of funding	NO	YES Support w/$	YES	YES dist & ABSSI	YES Supp w/$		YES	YES	YES P. secrs fnds	YES	YES fund for cont	
EVIDENCE OF ADM LEADERSHIP	LIMITED	LIMITED	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
ADM PERCEIVED AS C&I EXPERTS	...	NO	NO Does not participate in cur revisions	YES Ves vry acrs subj. areas	YES monit of clrm simpl.	YES		YES Gave model lesson demo	...	YES NO Mngr style ldr/ no curr strngth	YES AP of inst recognized by schl & dist as an expert	YES P. familiar w/ttl prgm ldrshp	
ADM PERCEIVED AS CHANGE EXPERTS	YES	NO	...	YES	YES	YES		LIMITED	YES	YES	YES	YES	
SHOW LEADERSHIP THROUGH ACTIONS	YES Tchrs acknowledge prin's prog support	LIMITED	YES P. hires best tchrs & gives them freedom	YES Knwldge of curr. alloc resources	YES clse coup curr reform	YES Tchrs acknw Tchr trnd sch around		LIMITED	YES Monthly staff meetings held to dev instr'n	YES P. has strngth as ch. agent	YES Gransmanship & instrctional support was visible	YES Fac knws strng comm of P.	
SUPPORT OF PROG FACILITATOR	...		YES (Dept Ch)	YES	YES	YES		YES	...	YES	YES	YES	
GUIDE PROG TO FULL IMPLEMENTATN	...		YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	LIMITED	YES	YES	
MAKE PROG SUPPORTIVE DECISIONS	...		YES	YES	YES	YES		...	YES	YES	YES	YES	
COMMENTS	Info re reforms communicated primarily by dept chairs	Dept hds sm to carry mst of reform at sch	Prin weeds out poor tchrs Equity issue is not major focus for schl	Clse coup w/ dept hds Integ instruct effort	clsd monitord by site adm	P. percvd dist at reform HS schl vision			Prin is visible in classroom Prin uses cooperative leadership styl	Chnge very slw prin supp curr ldshp deleg	The prin and AP worked as a compatible team to guide schl thru implementation	In sml schl sit, P. is catlyst for change	
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF COMMITMENT	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MOD - HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	
DECISION RULES													

CAUSAL FACTOR K1: ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT AND LEADERSHIP DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTORS AND ROUND 2 CASE STUDIES

TABLE 058 CAUSAL FACTOR K: ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT LEADERSHIP

1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
		BIG CITY (ADA 646,500 : 44,014)		MEDIUM CITIES (ADA 36,393 : 15,132)									
MAJOR AND SUBCOMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS	East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
EVIDENCE OF ADM COMMITMENT	YES Dist holds prin responsible for implementat'n	YES P. desires ref for sch	YES Supt member of Carnegie Task Force	YES P. discuss reform during Area mtgs	YES Strng dis/site commit								
SYMBOLIC COMMITMENT	YES Primary deliverer of support	YES	YES Prin encourages tchrs to innovate.	YES P. places reform prog on staff agendas	YES Prov. ldshp/ develop								
EXHIBIT KNOWLEDGE OF PROGRAM	. . .	YES	. . .	YES	YES								
APPEAR AT TRAINING SESSIONS	. . .	. . .	. . .	YES	YES								
ALLOCATE NECESSARY RESOURCES	. . .	. . . P. rec extnsv trng	NO Resources not always available	YES	YES Site adm knw prncpl wrkshp dist. prvd res								
INSIST ON PROGRAM CONTINUATION	. . .	YES	. . .	YES	YES								
TECHNICAL COMMITMENT	LIMITED Meets w/tchrs re CAP tests Member of CRI re. curriculum	YES Cent focus of agenda & disc on reform	YES Dist created cur guides & ordered tchrs to use them	YES program	YES Ofcls strng dist. commit								
GIVE DIRECT ASST TO TEACHERS	NO	NO	LIMITED	YES	YES								
PARTICIPATE IN INITIAL TRAINING	NO	. . .	. . .	YES	YES								
PARTICIPATE IN ONGOING TRAINING	NO Dist didn't provide assistance to prin to aid implementat'n	. . . P. monitors tch perf	YES Clin Super: a legal requirement motive not for CAI improvement	YES Adm team participated in ST & schl improvement training	YES P. prvds mgmt of prgm								
BUDGET FUNDING FOR CONTINUATION	. . .	YES	NO Not enough $	. . .	YES								
EVIDENCE OF ADM LEADERSHIP	LIMITED	YES	YES	MIXED	YES								
ADM PERCEIVED AS CAI EXPERTS	NO	YES P. prcieved as hvng mnml curr skills	NO Prin admits she is not an expert	NO Several tchrs see P as shallow & phoney	YES adm ldshp is mod strong								
ADM PERCEIVED AS CHANGE EXPERTS	. . .	YES	. . .	YES	YES								
SHOW LEADERSHIP THROUGH ACTIONS	LIMITED Meets monthly w/depts	YES Tchrs awre P. wnts posit results	YES P. hires best tchrs & gives them freedom	MIXED P does part w/followthru on her tasks	YES adm have high stand								
SUPPORT OF PROG FACILITATOR	. . .	YES	. . .	. . .	YES								
GUIDE PROG TO FULL IMPLEMENTATN	. . .	YES	. . .	YES	YES								
MAKE PROG SUPPORTIVE DECISIONS	. . .	YES	LIMITED	. . .	YES								
COMMENTS	Info re reforms communicated primarily by dept chairs	Snce dist commit strng, p. supps ref efforts	Prin sees role as creating effective teaching environment	Prin concerned primarily w/ personal. Head counslr is also leader	Princ lev of commit not beynd dist guidance								
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF COMMITMENT	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH								
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH								
DECISION RULES													

CAUSAL FACTOR K1: ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT AND LEADERSHIP

DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTORS AND ROUND 2 CASE STUDIES

TABLE G8A CAUSAL FACTOR K2: ADMINISTRATIVE PRESSURE AND MONITORING

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1			BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS								
2		(ADA: 646,500 - 44,041)				(ADA: 36,393 - 15,132)								
3	MAJOR/SUB COMPONENTS	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS							
4														
5	EVIDENCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRESSURE	NO	YES	YES		YES	YES							
6		District has not	Prin app pres	Curriculum		princ app	Hi press re dsgn							
7		yet developed a	in agenda	guides		limited press	cor cur, CAP &							
8		accountability	focusing and			to implem	Lean Dsgn (LD).							
9		prog; it's still i	discussion of			reforms at	New & exp tchrs							
10		early impl stag	reform			site	revwd & montrd							
11							re pgrm impl							
12	PRESS FOR FULL IMPLEM	NO	YES			YES	YES							
13	EARLY STAGE EXAMPLES	NO	Grad req			Txtbooks	YES							
14	LATER STAGE EXAMPLES	NO	qual Ind.			cert tchr	YES							
15	OTHER EXAMPLES	Support mainly	use of tests			eval	Press & montrng							
16		symbolic re				No	is intense							
17	PRESS FOR CONT ASSISTANCE	CAP results	LIMITED	NO		MODERATE	YES							
18	EARLY STAGE EXAMPLES	NO	Staff devel			stf devel	YES							
19	LATER STAGE EXAMPLES	NO	NO			NO	YES							
20	OTHER EXAMPLES	NO	NO			NO	Little press/							
21		Dpt Ch give cur					monit'd for HOTS							
22		reform directn												
23	EVIDENCE OF ADM MONITORING	YES	YES	EVAL		YES	YES							
24	MONITORING OF PROCESS	YES	YES			YES	YES							
25	MONITORING OF FIDELITY	NO	NO			YES	YES							
26	MONITORING OF STAFF CONC	NO	YES			YES	YES							
27	MONITORING OF EVALUATION	NO	YES			YES	YES							
28		Quarterly re-	Prin gen ams			eval is dep	LD pt in plc 5 yrs							
29		ports required	awre of			on CAP stcms	ago by Asst Supt							
30		showing stdnt	clsrm events			Ind sch perf	& lnked w/CAP							
31		math progress				pln								
32		LIMITED												
33	IDENTIFY TYPES OF MONITORING	Some reluctance	Admin Eval			Admn monits	Lot of "mngt by							
34		to press due to				pln carefully	walking around"							
35		tchr negot's &												
36		ill feel'gs												
37	IDENTIFY DEGREE OF PRESS APP	LIMITED	LOW	LOW		LOW	HIGH-Intnse admn							
38		. . .					pres re core							
39							cur-CAP, LD							
40	IDENTIFY EXTENT OF ADM	Dist is loosely	MODERATE			MODERATE	HIGH							
41	SUPP & ATT AT TRAINING SESSION	coupled between	MODERATE			MODERATE	HIGH							
42		dist school												
43		Dist doesn't ap-												
44		ply pressure or												
45		monitor schls												
46	COMMENTS	P. lacks active,	Prin does			Nw prin does	Supt put CAP							
47		direct leadrshp	initiate press			not enjoy	emphasis in plc							
48			and monitor			ttl confidence	10 yrs ago &							
49			at low levels			of stf to this	remains the driv							
50						point	force of district							
51														
52														
53	OVERALL ASSESMENT OF PRESSURE	LOW	LOW	LOW - MOD		LOW	HIGH							
54	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF MONITORING	LOW	LOW	LOW - MOD		LOW	HIGH							
55														
56														
57														
58														
59														
60														
61														
62														
63	CAUSAL FACTOR K2 ADMINISTRATIVE PRESSURE AND MONITORING			DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS AND ROUND TWO CASE STUDIES										
64														
65														

TABLE Q6 B CAUSAL FACTOR K2 ADMINISTRATOR PRESSURE AND MONITORING

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17	18
1			BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS		
2		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)			(ADA 36,393 - 30,850)				(ADA 15,132 - 14,001)			(ADA 18,341 - 182)		
3	MAJOR AND SUB-COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	
4								DATA N/S						
5	EVIDENCE OF ADM PRESSURE	NO	YES	MIXED	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES (LIMITED)	YES	YES	YES	
6		District has not	Vrys acrs cmpon	Dist's AGP core	Dist press on	report of rel lag	Prin says		Hi press re dis	"We (dist) do	Maj curr refs	Press used to en-	Sml sch setting	
7		yet developed an	of rel eff monit	cur and Schl's	site princ. this	gerated regl	press on all		sure cur, CAP	not have to	in vry erly	sure schl imple-	be tght coupling	
8		accountability	reveals loose	discipline prog	press on tchrs	pressure on	to my best		and Lesson De-	use pressure"	stgs of implem	mentation of pro	Princ consist	
9		prog. It's still in	coupling	received high	re implement	impl efforts	accept of		sign (LD)	Pressure is		gram that meets	exerts press	
10		early impl stage		press			dist rels and		New & exper-	present more		minimum require-		
11				Cur guides pre			site lvls		ienced tchrs	from P level		ments of district		
12				pared at dist &					are reviewed	re schl vision		standard		
13				sent to schls to					and monitored	programs		Press is both dist		
14				use as guide. No					re program	improved CSI,		and schl & in-		
15				pressure to imp					implementat'n	climate, attnd		cludes tchr buyin		
16	PRESS FOR FULL IMPLEMENTATION	NO	YES	MIXED	NO	YES	YES		YES	YES (LIMITED)	YES	YES	YES	
17	EARLY STAGE EXAMPLES	NO	MCS	YES	NO	MCS	YES		YES	YES (LIMITED)	MCS/tsts	YES	YES (LIMITED)	
18	LATER STAGE EXAMPLES	NO	Mentors	LIMITED	NO	Grad stand	YES (LIMITED)		YES	YES (LIMITED)	Mntrs no monit	YES	MCS	
19	OTHER EXAMPLES		Quality Indicators	Core cur in place	NO	Mentors	Dynam Ldshp		Press & moni-	Press is schl		Dept chrs do clin	NO	
20				therefore little			of prev princ		toring is in-	based and mon		ical supr on tchrs	NO	
21				current press			exerted press		tense	ly by dept chrs		in dept & followup		
22	PRESS FOR CONTINUED ASSISTANCE	NO	NO	MIXED	Ref not in full	Mst comp frmly	YES		YES	YES (LIMITED)	YES	YES	YES	
23	EARLY STAGE EXAMPLES	NO	NO	YES	implementation	in plce UC grd	YES		YES	YES (LIMITED)	STFF DEVEL	YES	Stf Dev grad	
24	LATER STAGE EXAMPLES	NO	NO	LIMITED		clsrm lvl still	YES		YES	YES (LIMITED)	NO	YES	req. CAP tstng	
25	OTHER EXAMPLES	Tchrs report lit	NO	Dist offers vol-		dev 10th gr	Otsde consult		There is little	Dist support is	NO	Support is given	Continue to	
26		to adm pressure	NO	untary trng re		couns Dist/schl	hrd to prov		press/monitr'	available, schl	Press frm dist/	thru staff devel	exert press	
27		Dist leadrs lacks	Loosely coupled	cur guides		all tightly	asst on curr		for HOTS	has plan for on	princ supports	grants, dept mtg		
28		being developed				coupled	chng incl sp ev			going training		dist committees		
29	EVIDENCE OF ADM MONITORING	NO	LIMITED	MIXED	LIMITED	YES	YES (LIMITED)		YES	YES (LIMITED)	LIMITED	YES	YES	
30	MONITORING RE PROCESS	NO	NO	LIMITED	NO	YES	YES		YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	
31	MONITORING RE FIDELITY	NO	NO	LIMITED	NO	YES	YES		YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	
32	MONITORING RE STAFF CONCERNS	YES	LIMITED	LIMITED	NO	LIMITED	YES		YES	YES (LIMITED)	NO	YES	YES	
33	MONITORING RE EVALUATION (.)	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	Prin maint hgh		YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	
34		See above, the	Little monit info.	Little monitrg re	Monit geared to	All cmpnts	visib tght site		LD put in place	Dist monitoring	Ref implem in	Dist monitoring is	Princ clsly	
35		dist's eval phase	MCS, mentors	core curr, text	eval process	dving moderate	coupling		5yrs ago by	is primarily	erly stages	for compliance	monit curr	
36		has not yet been		books, or trng		to high monit			Asst Supt &	for compliance		w/local standard	align	
37		implemented							linked w/CAP	w/state req's		Schl monitoring is		
38	IDENTIFY TYPES OF MONITORING	NONE	District level	NONE	District level	Dist/Site monit	Prin is co		There is a lot	CAP scores	Dist/primarily	for prog improv	Prin/supt sme	
39				Dept's monitor			in clsrms/on		of "mgt by	Dept Mtgs		CAP, dist reports	clsrm obsrvtion	
40				setngs			campus		walking arnd"	SIP program		AB551, 65, 803		
41	IDENTIFY DEGREE OF PRESSURE APPLIED	NONE	LOW	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH		HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	
42		Some reluctance	Prin prefs	P. gives praise	Dist more than	at both dist &	Prin prov budg		Intense adm've	Schl sees little	Dist admn was	Pressure includes	Prin cmmted to	
43		to press due to	little pressure	money, and	site	site levels	supp		press re core	press from the	little auth prin	a well devel prof	change	
44		tchr negotiations		symbolic suppt					cur-CAP, LD	dist office	responds to dist	commitment to		
45		and re [illegible]										schl improvem't		
46	IDENTIFY EXTENT OF ADM SUPPORT &	LIMITED	LIMITED	MODERATE	NONE	MODERATE	HIGH		HIGH	MODERATE	LIMITED	HIGH	MODERATE	
47	ATTENDANCE AT TRAINING SESSIONS	...		...			...		HIGH	...		HIGH		
48														
49	COMMENTS	Dist is loosely	Dist is loosely	Tchrs feel sup-	Dist ref effort	Dist tightly cpld	Dist is incrsd		Supt put CAP	Schl sees press	Dist jst beg ref	An atmosphere of	Dist is mvng to	
50		coupled between	coupled pressure	ported, prog's	is lsly coupled	& clsly coupled	tightly coupled		emphasis in	from state	impl no real	prof collegiality	implm prse frm	
51		dist school	emerges from dis	in place except	site is presnt.	Ref comp are	as is site		place10yr ago	policy & SIP	auth& impetus	exists between	princ is simg	
52		Dist does not ap	site adm press.	courses depen-	within pilots	in plce and chng			& remains the	program	frm cent office	tchr-adm and	sml size & cls	
53		ply pressure at	very low	dent on new		is occuring			driving force	Schl press HI	princ reactive	schl-dist related	coupling are	
54		monitor schls		textbooks					of the district	for local prog	cent off initiive	to schl reform	assets	
55	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PRESSURE	LOW	LOW	LOW-MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	
56	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF MONITORING	LOW	LOW	LOW-MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	
57														
58	DECISION RULES PROPOSED FOR CAUSAL FACTOR CHARTS													
59														
60														
61	YES Data supports item's presence		HIGH All critical components are in place											
62	NO Data does not support presence		MODERATE More than half are in place											
63	LIMITED Item is minimally present		LOW Less than half are in place											
64	--- No data available		DATA NA Data not submitted											
65	CAUSAL FACTOR K2 ADMINISTRATOR PRESSURE AND MONITORING			DATA SOURCE CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS AND ROUND 2 CASE STUDIES										

TABLE G7A CAUSAL FACTOR L LATITUDE AND FIDELITY

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17
1			BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS	
2		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)				(ADA 36,383 - 30,850)			(ADA 15,132 - 14,081)			(ADA 18,341 - 182)	
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capital City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
4	NATURE OF LATITUDE (HIGH LOW)	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW - closely	MODERATE	DATA N/S	LOW	HIGH (Dist Schl	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
5		Minimum dis-	Vrs acrs cmpnt	There is no room	Snc dist ref	coop dist/pervs	cmpnts adoptd/		Essentially no lat	LOW (Sch-Tchr)	Char implem of	Latitude was allow	mst comps adoptd
6		cretion given	bt mst hve	for latitude re	intd prior to	low att/high fid	monit & prss		itude for deviat'n	At schl level it is	most componts	ed to the degree	acc to leg intent
7		schools once	high latitude	course offerings	813		are not high		from dist model	adm who require		that schools met	
8		program was		Latitude exists re					re curr focused	low latitude and		the minimum re-	
9		adopted		testing, inst tech					on CAP & LD	high fidelity		quirements	
10	EVIDENCE OF LOW LATITUDE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
11	SOURCE OF PRESSURE (D S DEPT)	DIST & PEER	D	DIST	D/S	D	D-S		DISTRICT	SCHOOL	NONE	DIST SCHL DEPT	D/S
12	DEGREE OF PRESSURE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	High Sch grd req	MODERATE		STRONG	STRONG	NONE	MODERATE	MODERATE
13	NATURE OF PRESSURE	Little press be-	Grd req basis	Approved courses	MTs, 10th grd		10th grd couns		Dist evaluation	P mandate	mnt tchr, MCS	Dist policy, schl	grad req, longer
14		yond commitmt	of program	CAP scores	cnsing				of tchrs & adm		& qual ind	prog, adm and	school yr
15		to curr&textbks		Direction giving					is prog based			dept chr press	
16	EVIDENCE OF HIGH LATITUDE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
17	DIST SCHL USER ADAPTATION	USER	D/D	USER	D/S	S	S		NONE ALLOWED	DISTRICT	D/S	SCHOOL	D
18	BLUNTING OR TRIVIALIZATION	YES	YES	NO	NO	OVERTIME	YES		NO	YES	INITIAL	NO	INITIAL
19	INITIAL OR OVERTIME ADAPTATN	OVERTIME	Intl qual/ind	OVERTIME	INITIAL	hw pol, impl delg	OVERTIME		NONE ALLOWED	INITIAL	char of vrt all	INITIAL & OVERTIME	st dev out of dist
20		No tchr asst w/	MCS, txts, stf	Adaptations made	qual ind, MCS	to schs	of MCS,		Some approved	Adm tchr eval		Schl given degree	bec of dist size
21		implementat'n	development	for ind courses					deviations allowed	tng not used		of latitude to adapt	
22	NATURE OF FIDELITY (HIGH LOW)	MODERATE	MODERATES	MODERATE	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE		HIGH	LOW (dist schl)	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
23		HI FI for curr,	vrs grtly acrs	Minimizing	Dist/sch goals	sch monit comp	vrs acrs comps		Careful dist/schl	HIGH (sch tchr)	early stage of	High fidelity to the	D/S
24		textbks & tchr	components	dist monitor'g	are prim, but	weekly impl	sme areas not		prog monitoring		impl for most	approved prog that	have effected rel
25		evaluation		SIP program used	gen compatible		impl bec of lw		This is a central		components	had a planned de-	
26		LO FI for 10th		for monitoring	w/SB 813		pressure		ized district			gree of flexibility	
27		Gr Counseling		schl program								& min requirem'ts	
28	EVIDENCE OF LOW FIDELITY	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
29		10th Gr Counslg	Sch asst stf	Schls vision is	MCS, tcl qual	Mentor teachers	homework pol		Some concern re	Mentors used dif	all components	Courses of study	Txtbk adopt
30		No effective	development	not as focused on	indicators				elem design for	ferently than		& textbks were	MCS-early impl
31		monitoring syst		dist equity issue					secondary stdnts	dist intended		schl choice	stage
32	AUTHORITY FOR CHANGE (D S T)	SCHOOL	SCHOOL	DISTRICT-SCHOOL	D	D	D-S		DISTRICT	SCHOOL	D/S	DISTRICT-SCHOOL	D/S
33	REASONS FOR CHANGE	Lack of site adm	lck of site adm	To better meet	Dist pln allows	No respns to	No monit of		Some deviation is	Dist's attempt to	Abs of dis or	Dist has strong	sml sch constrns
34		follow thru &	monit/ung asst	local stdnt and	lr site adapt	monit/supv	use of policy		allowed from	minimally intrude	site pressure	tradition of local	
35		pressure		program needs					CAP review prog	allowed differences		schl control	
36	EVIDENCE OF HIGH FIDELITY	YES		YES	NO- mnt tchr	YES	YES		YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
37		Dist cur and	Q&B stf trng	Core cur& related	adm trng	Cert of tchr	mnt tchr, adm		Requirements gen	Tchr use of ap-		Gr Req, min reqmt	grd req, mont tch
38		textbooks		textbks in place		evals	trng		used & accepted	proved curr		for courses & textbks	
39	SOURCE OF PRESSURE (D S DEPT)	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	DISTRICT	none	D	D		DISTRICT	SCHOOL	NONE	DISTRICT-SCH DP	D/S some
40		Strong dist in-	no ongng asst	Schl gets funding		crfty dlnd cert	Dist pro fr the		Tchr & adm eval	Tchrs not followg		Schls and tchrs	D/S pressure
41		fluence & tchr	at site indicate	for only approved		projects	& 10th grd co		uations are based	approved cur are		bought into reform	resulted in impl
42		ownership	latitude	courses of study					on prog imp/rslt	removed		& press for implem	
43	MATCH BETWN PROG & PRACTICE	YES (cur & text	NO	YES	YES (limited)	YES (Vry limited	YES (LIMITED)		YES	YES (SCHOOL)	NO	YES	YES
44	FEW VARIATIONS ACROSS CLSRMS	YES (cur & text	YES	NO	YES	except for 2-3	comps vry in rl		NO	YES (SCHOOL)	many variations	NO	NO
45	COMMENTS	Dist use of CRT	Latitude & fid	Schls must offer	Latitude & fid	comps -	to lat/fid/press		The Lesson Design	The high fidelity	Impl of early	Dif depts had dif	sml site of sch
46		assisted w/ tchr	very acr	core cur	nt pressured at	all others char by			pedagogy & dist	for tchr use of	stge progress to	ferent degrees of	requres some
47		acceptance and	comp of reform	Non-core courses	slt/discretion	latt and low fid			curr is in place	the approved cur	date is	fidelity across the	adaptation
48		use of dist curr		can be offered	allowd in adpting				Growing concern	is viewed by	unimpressive	classrooms	
49		P vote power		w/dist approval	program				is being express	tchrs as being		On paper all depts	
50		does not apply		Like courses					by secondary	a positive way		are in place	
51		after decision		must use same					tchrs re lack of	of improving		In practice courses	
52		is reached re		textbook					latitude for adap-	teaching at the		of study are not	
53		program or imp-		Limited credi-					ting program to	school		being implemented	
54		lementation		ability for Cen-					better meet the	The dist does not		uniformly in some	
55		This is a loosely		tral Office curr					needs of secon-	believe in a top		depts (notably in	
56		coupled district		staff & products					dary students	down adm style		Soc Studies)	
57	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF LATITUDE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	NA	LOW	LO (S) - HI (D)	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
58	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF FIDELITY	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	HI (S) - LO (D)	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
59	DECISION RULES FOR CAUSAL FACTOR L LATITUDE AND FIDELITY												
60	NO Data does not support item's presence		HIGH All critical components are in place										
61	YES Data does support item's presence		MODERATE More than half of the critical component are in place										
62	LIMITED Item is minimally present		LOW Less than half of the critical components are in place										
63	— Item not considered or no data supplied		STRONG Data supports presence of a great deal of pressure										
64													
65													
66	CAUSAL FACTOR L LATITUDE AND FIDELITY		DATA SOURCE CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS AND ROUND 2 CASE STUDIES										

TABLE G7B CAUSAL FACTOR I: LATITUDE AND FIDELITY

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1													
2			BIG CITY		MEDIUM DISTRICTS								
3		(ADA:	646,500 - 44,014)		(ADA: 28,393 - 30,850)								
4	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS	East Bay MS	LA Metro MS							
5	NATURE OF LATITUDE (HIGH MIX LOW)	LOW	MODERATE	MIXED	MODERATE	LOW							
6		Minimum dis	Prin has agnda	Dist cur guides	Nw prin did nt	Essentially no latit.							
7		cretion given	locus & decsn	used by tchrs	wrk twrd	for deviat'n frm							
8		schools	on rel orient	as bench mark	full impl	dist mod re: curr							
9		Tchr ownershp	trwd results			based on CAP & LD							
10	EVIDENCE OF LOW LATITUDE	YES	NO		YES	YES							
11	SOURCE OF PRESSURE (D S DEPT)	DIST & PEER	S		D	DISTRICT							
12	DEGREE OF PRESSURE	STRONG	Little press in		HIGH	STRONG							
13	NATURE OF PRESSURE	Adm reg's	any area		all cmpnts	Dst eval of tchrs							
14					in plc at site	& adm is pgm bsd							
15	EVIDENCE OF HIGH LATITUDE		YES	YES	NO	NO							
16	DIST SCH USER ADAPTATION		SCH/USER	USER	SCHOOL	NONE ALLOWED							
17	BLUNTING OR TRIVIALIZATION		YES	NO	YES	NO							
18	INITIAL OR OVERTIME ADAPTAT'N		OVERTIME	OVERTIME	Intl hgh #GSL & hgh mtvtn	NONE ALLOWED-sme apprvd dev allwd							
19	NATURE OF FIDELITY (HIGH MIX-LOW)	HI (GENERALLY)	LOW		LOW	HIGH							
20		Dependent on			no real curr change	Crtrl dst/sch prog mgmt.							
21		type of reform				in a centralized district							
22	EVIDENCE OF LOW FIDELITY	YES	YES		YES - MCS, qual led	NO							
23		Schl wide dis-	no efft monit		no strong ldrshp	Sme cncrn re elem desgn							
24		ipline program	at site			for secondary students							
25	AUTHORITY FOR CHANGE (D-S-T)	SCHOOL	D-S		NONE	DISTRICT							
26	REASONS FOR CHANGE	Lack of site adm	lck of dis/site		P. not prvd sust dir at	Sme deviat'n allowed frm							
27		monitoring &	folw thru		site	CAP review program							
28		pressure											
29	EVIDENCE OF HIGH FIDELITY	YES	NO - OSBII trg		NO	YES							
30		Cur & textbks	lc ongng asst			Regs gen used & accepted							
31	SOURCE OF PRESSURE (D-S-DEPT)	DISTRICT	S/DEPT		D-S	DISTRICT							
32		Strong dist in-				Tchr & adm evaluations							
33		fluence re cur				are based on prog imp/rslt							
34		and instruction											
35	MATCH BETWN PROG & PRACTICE	YES	YES		NO	YES							
36	FEW VARIATIONS ACROSS CLSRMS	YES	YES		YES	NO							
37			dist provd			The Lesson Design pedagogy							
38	COMMENTS	Dist uses CRT's	struct fr chng		Nw princ has not yet	& dist curr is in place							
39		w/ schl rep's	but lck ongng		assrtd hmslf as curr	Grwng concern expressed							
40		to arrive at	asst & site		ldr at site	by secondary tchrs re							
41		decisions	monit do not			lack of latitude for							
42		Prin have veto	suppt full impl			adapting prgm to better							
43		power prior				meet needs of sec students							
44		to decision &											
45		forced to abide											
46		mentation.											
47													
48	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF LATITUDE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW							
49	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF FIDELITY	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH							
50													
51	DECISION RULES:												
52													
53													
54													
55													
56													
57	CAUSAL FACTOR I: LATITUDE AND FIDELITY												
58			DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTORS AND ROUOND 2 CASE STUDY										
59													
60													
61													
62													
63													
64													
65													

TABLE G8A CAUSAL FACTOR M1: EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL LINKING AGENT FOR ONGOING ASSISTANCE - HS

	1 2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17	18
1			BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS		
2		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)			(ADA: 36,393 - 30,850)				(ADA 15,132 - 14,091)			(ADA 18,341 - 182)		
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	
4	EXTERNAL LINKING AGENT (ELA)	YES (Tchr eval	YES-UCLA sum	YES (Tchr eval	YES	NOT USED	NOT USED	DATA N/S	YES-Upfront	NO	YES	NOT USED	NOT USED	
5	EVIDENCE OF HIGH QUALITY ASSISTANCE	YES	Inst for dpt ch						training only	ELA have been		Ongoing staff dev		
6	1 ELA WAS CREDIBLE PERSON	NO	YES	. . .	YES				provided by	used but not	YES-Kl Mrsh prg	has been a major		
7	2 ASST WAS USER ORIENTED	NO	YES	. . .	YES				neighboring	for ongoing	YES less desgn	priority for the		
8	3 ASST WAS CONCRETE & CONTINUOUS	NO	NO	. . .	Yes				district re	asst	Yes-3 yr prg dev	school and the		
9	EVIDENCE THAT ASST VARIED OVER TIME	NO		YES					elements of	Examples	"to prepr tcl trs	the driving force		
10	1 INITIATION STAGE ASST	YES		YES					teaching and	Rita Dunn Lrng		for the change		
11	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	. . .		. . .	YES				clinical sup-	Styles		process		
12	PROGRAM ADAPTION/ADOPTION	YES		. . .	YES				ervision	County Office		Ongoing asst is		
13	ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE	NO		YES	YES				County staff	Operation	YES-positive	provided in a		
14	2 IMPLEMENTATION STAGE ASST	NO		YES					are becoming	Wing Spread		number of ways		
15	PROVIDED LOGICAL SUPPORT	NO	YES	. . .	YES				important	TECC	YES	that include dist		
16	TRAINED INTERANAL TRAINERS	YES (LIMITED)		YES	NO				actors in re		YES-pl of or prg	and school per-		
17	CONDUCTED DEMONSTRATIONS	. . .		. . .	NO				form process		YES	sonnel Mentors		
18	PROVIDED FOLLOWUP/COACHING	NO		NO	NO				re CAP, MCS		YES	Dept Chairs, Re-		
19	IDENTIFIED RESOURCES	. . .		. . .	YES				writing proc			source Teachers		
20	AIDED PROG CONTINUATION	NO		. . .	YES				frameworks		YES	& Cross Role Trns		
21	INTERNAL LINKING AGENT (ILA)	YES		YES					YES	YES		YES		
22	CENTRAL OFFICE ACTED AS ILA	YES/LIMITED		YES/LIMITED					YES	YES		YES		
23		Staffing not ad		Specialists are					Well supplied	Mainly functions		Dist staff develop		
24		equate to guide		available on as					w/highly	to monitor		based on annual		
25		C & I support		needed basis					talented ILA	compliance		needs assessm't		
26	1 CO PROVIDED SYMBOLIC SUPPORT	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES-pos reinf	YES-dist	YES strng		YES	YES	YES-fndng/rel	YES	YES-strng	
27		Supported task		Support SIP	to rch goals	curr coor	commitment		Syr stat dev	Provides $ for	time	Provides support	support	
28		forces develop		program					program	tchr stipends		staff & funding		
29	2 CO PROVIDED TECHNICAL SUPPORT	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES-rel time	YES-trng	YES-nw tchg		YES	YES	YES-curr spec	YES	YES-mentor	
30		No new effort	Taling Asst	Provide excel	for pgrm dev	cls mgmt	adptd crrs		Dist spclsts	Personnel made		Dist staff develop	teachers	
31		Dist wrkshps		lent inservice		tchrs/spec	outline devel		give dir asst	available to		committee plans		
32		OK, not enough				asst				give dir asst		& conducts trainng		
33	PRINCIPAL AS ILA	YES/LIMITED		NO					YES			YES (Mainly AP)		
34	1 PRIN DEMONSTRATED COMMITMENT	Strong potentia	YES	Not involved	YES-glo sch	YES-strng	YES-strong		YES		YES-not curr ldr	YES	YES-princ	
35			"We Care" Pgr	in curr devel	clim, clglality	commitment	commitment		Demo/model	Supports devel		Strong advocate	supt same	
36	2 PRIN MONITORING/PRESSURE	but poor climate	YES	No prog focus	YES-mntn hgh	YES-moderat	YES-moderate		YES	YES	YES-minimal	YES	YES-pr & spt	
37	MENTORS AS ILA	NO	YES	NO	YES-curr dev		YES-ev tr coch		NO	NO	YES-reinf by	YES	YES-mentors	
38		Cur dev only		Not formally			on as curr dir		No MTP in dist	Cur dev focus	curr dir	Mainly staff dev		
39	DEPT CHAIRS AS ILA	NO	YES	NO	YES-curr dev	YES	NO		NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
40		Potential use		Not formally						Prin's adm arm		Serve critical role		
41	OTHERS AS ILA	NO	YES	YES		YES-resource	YES-inst spec		YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	
42		Tchrs want		SIP committee		teachers			Cur Teams	Tchrs must		AP of Instruction		
43		more share time		important ILA					help w/ revue	share cont info		strong cur leader		
44	EXTERNAL INTERNAL LINKING AGENT FIT	YES (LIMITED)		NO ELA	YES	NO ELA	NO ELA		YES	NO ELA	NO ELA	NO ELA	NO ELA	
45	1 EVIDENCE OF COORDINATION	NO		NA	YES-pckrd grt	NA	NA		yes	NA	NA	NA	NO	
46					comp reg prog				Schl and dist			Close dist school		
47									maintain on-			coordination in		
48									going contac			a number of areas		
49	2 EVIDENCE OF TEACHER BUY IN	NO		NA	YES-imp sch	NA	NA		NA	NA		Strong tchr buyin	NA	
50					clim/clglality							Grants for staff		
51	COMMENTS	No comprehen-	Mst asst der	Tchrs must	alth cent off.	asst pro by	strng cent off		ELA may play	Ongoing asst is	and lr Imp of ELA	development have	princ/supt	
52		sive staff dev	frm cent off	seek out help	sto initiated	ad rng dist	mv to rel supp		more impor-	important part	asst low imp	been a key to co-	prov vis & high	
53		plan yet devel	dpt all curr ins	No followup or	asst generous	res Prim tsk	by st admin		tant role due	of reform prog	vry erly stg of	ordination and	exp supp rel	
54		Ongoing training	no emph prov	asst with dist	phd grt prov	curr imp,dsgn	mts prov mn		later stages	SIP prog & $	dev/prim impet	provision of on-	OTH link not	
55		is new priority	to shrng at sts	workshops	ind adit st dev	wrkshps,txt	st dev for dist		re Wave 3	are critical	from curr dir	going assistance	developed	
56		Adm trng prgm		SIP/WASC										
57		using ELA was		tm recmded ad										
58		not effective		tr mr stf inserv										
59				re tchng strat										
60				& methodologies										
61	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ELA IMPACT	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH	NOT USED	NOT USED	NA	MODERATE	NOT USED	LOW	NOT USED	NOT USED	
62	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ILA IMPACT	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	
63														
64	CAUSAL FACTOR M1 EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL LINKING AGENT FOR ONGOING ASSISTANCE				DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS									
65														

TABLE G8 B CAUSAL FACTOR M1 EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL LINKING AGENT FOR ONGOING ASSISTANCE

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1			BIG CITY		MEDIUM DISTRI	AN JHS AND MS								
2		(ADA	646,500 -	44,014)	(ADA 30,393	15,132)								
3	MAJOR AND SUBCOMPONENT PARTS	Capital City MS	LA City JHS	[illegible] JHS	East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
4	EXTERNAL LINKING AGENT (ELA)	YES	NOT USED	NOT USED	NOT USED	YES Upland								
5	EVIDENCE OF HIGH QUALITY ASSISTANCE	NO	Materials on	Teachers are	Asst seems to									
6	1 ELA WAS CREDIBLE PERSON	NO	writing across	not cross role	be primarily a	YES								
7	2 ASST WAS USER ORIENTED	NO	the curr prepd	teams for tea	central office	. . .								
8	3 ASST WAS CONCRETE & CONTINUING	NO	from NLA and	team selected	funct. Curr	[illegible]								
9	EVIDENCE THAT ASST VARIED OVER TIME	YES	nat'l pub cente	SIP/WASC	supvd and res	. . .								
10	1 INITIATION STAGE ASST	YES	Dist training	team recom-	and develop	. . .								
11	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	. . .	in lesson dsgn	mended a need	Department	Uplnd trng								
12	PROGRAM ADAPTION/ADOPTION	YES	Est. dist prov	for more staff	provide staff	only prov by								
13	ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE	NO	staff devel	inservice re	development	ngtiatng dist re								
14	2 IMPLEMENTATION STAGE ASST	YES(LIMITED)	release time	tching strat		elements of tchng								
15	PROVIDED LOGICAL SUPPORT	NO	provided for	egies and		& clin supv Co								
16	TRAINED INTERANAL TRAINERS	YES (LIMITED)	staff develop	methodologies		stff bcmng								
17	CONDUCTED DEMONSTRATIONS	. . .		District is pre		imprtnt actors								
18	PROVIDED FOLLOWUP/COACHING	NO		occupied with		in rel proc re								
19	IDENTIFIED RESOURCES	. . .		equity and re		CAP MCS wrtng								
20	AIDED PROG CONTINUATION	NO		form per se		proc frmwrks								
21	INTERNAL LINKING AGENT (ILA)	YES		YES		YES								
22	CENTRAL OFFICE ACTED AS ILA	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES								
23		Staffing not ad		Specialists are		Well supplied								
24		equate to guide		available on an		w/highly								
25		C & I support		needed basis		talented ILA								
26	1 CO PROVIDED SYMBOLIC SUPPORT	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES								
27		Supported task		Support SIP		5 yr staff dev								
28		forces develop		program		program w/ $								
29	2 CO PROVIDED TECHNICAL SUPPORT	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES/LIMITED	YES	YES								
30		No new effort		Provide excel		Site res tchr &								
31		Dist wrkshps		lent inservice		Specialist								
32		OK, not enough				give dir asst								
33	PRINCIPAL AS ILA	YES/LIMITED		NO										
34	1 PRIN DEMONSTRATED COMMITMENT	Strong potentia	YES	Not involved	YES	YES								
35				in curr devel		Demo/model								
36	2 PRIN MONITORING/PRESSURE	but poor climat	YES	No prog focus	YES	YES								
37	MENTORS AS ILA	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO								
38		Cur dev only		Not formally		No MTP in dist								
39	DEPT CHAIRS AS ILA	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO								
40		Potential use		Not formally										
41	OTHERS AS ILA	NO	YES-TESTING	YES	NO	YES								
42		Tchrs want		SIP committee		Peer observa-								
43		more share time		important ILA		tions & cur lmt								
44	EXTERNAL INTERNAL LINKING AGENT FIT	YES (LIMITED)	NO ELA	NO ELA	NO ELA	YES								
45	1 EVIDENCE OF COORDINATION	NO	NA	NA	NA	YES								
46	2 EVIDENCE OF TEACHER BUY IN	NO	YES											
47														
48														
49	2 EVIDENCE OF OWNERSHIP EXCHANGE													
50														
51	COMMENTS	No comprehen-		Tchrs must		ELA may play								
52		sive staff dev		seek out help		more impor-								
53		plan yet devel		No followup on		tant role dur-								
54		Ongoing training		asst with dist		later stages								
55		is new priority		workshops		re Wave 3								
56		Adm trng prog												
57		wrking												
58		ELA was not												
59		effective												
60		Dist acknwldgd												
61		ongn trng inadq												
62		made it nw												
63		district priority												
64														
65	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ELA IMPACT	NOT USED	NOT USED	NOT USED	NOT USED	MODERATE								
66	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ILA IMPACT	LOW	HIGH	LOW		HIGH								
67	CAUSAL FACTOR M1 EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL LINKING AGENT FOR ONGOING ASSISTANCE				DATA SOURCE CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS									

TABLE G8A CAUSAL FACTOR M2 CONTENT, TIME, INTENSITY, AND TYPE OF ONGOING ASSISTANCE

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17
1			BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS	
2		(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)			(ADA 36,393 - 30,050)				(ADA 15,132 - 14,091)			(ADA 10,341 - 187)	
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
4		A=Adm/T=Tchr	A=Adm/T=Tchr	A=Adm/T=Tchr	A=Adm/T=Tchr		A=Adm/T=Tchr	DATA NA	A=Adm/T=Tchr	A=Adm/T=Tchr	A=Adm/T=Tchr	A=Adm/T=Tchr	A=Adm/T=Tchr
5	EVIDENCE OF CONTENT ASSISTANCE	A 8 (Tchr Evl)	A 4,7,8	A 8 (Cln Supv)	A 8	A 8	A 8	Schl has not	A 4-8	A 8	A 8	A 8	A None/T 4-7-8
6	1 MATH 5 SOCIAL STUDIES	T 4 8	T 1-4, 7, 8	T 3 4	T 8	T 1 3 4 8	T 3,5	yet entered	T 4-7-8	T 8	T 8	T 1-2-3-4-5	Adm goes one dy
7	2 SCIENCE 6 ESL	8=Clssrm Mgt	8= OSB III	T3 Wrtg Across	8 = Keys lrng	8 mo mtg thru	8= Tchr eval	full imple-	A4=Cln Tchng	A8=SIP Qual Revw	Adm the tchrom	A8 Clinical Superv	a wk pr yr for
8	3 ENGLISH 7 TEST PREP	Student Disc	& Cln Supv	Cur (Bay Area	(gen sch probs)	of st dev per	mthds Sci/SS	mentation	& Cln Supervsn	Cln Supervsn	tchr eval trng	T4 Effective Tchg	cert trng. Prin
9	4 GEN PEDAGOGY 8 OTHER	No coherent prog		Wrtg Proj &		yr tchrs trng	to wrt scr curr	stage	A8= Applly Disc	T8=Cln Teaching	Tchrs by then		prov all asst to
10		for ongoing asst		Local Univ)		crse in clk			T4=Cln Tch &	There is limited	less dsgn prgm	Ongoing assistance	tchrs
11				T4 Cln Tchg &		management			Lsn Design	evidence of on-		for tchrs is limited	
12				TESA					T8 = Applly Disc	going asst vers		and ad hoc in nature	
13	TIME OF ASSISTANCE					A 8 hrs/T ..			T3,5, For Long	for Clncl Tchg	A 4 hr/T ..		A --/T varies
14	LENGTH OF ONGOING ASSISTANCE	A 20hrs/T 3yrs	A --/T --	A 23hrs/T ---	A 7 yr/T 7 yr	A --/T --	A --/T --		A 4 5d/T 4 5d	A --/T 1 5hr/mit	A 1985 to pres	A 5dys/T 5dys	A --T unknown
15	WHEN DID IT BEGIN/END	A ---/T 85-88	A --/T --	A --/T 85---	A 1981-Pres	A 3/T 1/2	A --/T --		1982 ongoing	Annual Training	T 1984 to pres	Annual Training	A --/T ongoing
16	1 UPFRONT 2 ONGOING	A 1 / T 2	A / /T 1,2	A 1 / T 1	T 1981-Pres		A 3/T 1		A/T 1983 to pr	A --2/T 1	A 2/T 1 2	A 1 / T 1	
17		T AB 551		T 4min dys/yr	A 3/T 3				5 yrs ongoing	T 2inserv dys/yr			
18	INTENSITY OF ASSISTANCE					A Mod/T Mod			training progrm	SIP-551-803 base	A Low/T Mod	Clcl Supv/Tchg	A None/T Low
19	DEGREE OF INTENSITY		A Mod,T Lw	Clncl Supv/Tchg	A LW/T LW	A 3/T 3	A Low/T Low		A 2-3	A 2-3	A 4/T 3	training is 2 & 3	A --/T 1
20	1 INFORMAL 3 STRUCTURED	A 3/T 3	A 3/T 3	A 3 / T 3	A 3/T 3	A 2,4/T 2,4	A 3/T 1		T 2-3	T 2-3	A 5/T ..	All other ongoing	A --/T 2-4
21	2 THOROUGH 4 SLIGHT	A 4/T 2	A 2/T 2	A 2 / T 2	A --/T --		A --/T --			A/T M Hunter		asst is 1 & 2 or 4	
22	TYPE OF ASSISTANCE				A 1-2-3-5	A 1-3-5	A 1-3-5			Clinical Model	A 2-4-5-6		A ..
23	1 ACTUAL TRAING 4 PROB SOLVG	A 1-2-3	A 1-2-3-4	A ---/T ---	T 1-2-3-5	T 1-3-5	T 1-3-5		A 1-2-3	A 1-2-3	T 1-3-5	Clcl Supv/Tchg is	T 2-4
24	2 STRUCTURED 5 INFORMAL	T 1&4 2-3	T 1-2	Asst based on					T 1-2-3	T 1-2-3		1-2-3	
25	3 SCHEDULED 6 HAPHAZARD			annual needs						Most of the asst		All other is 4-5-6	
26				assessment						is upfront			
27	RELATED TO DIST/SCHOOL 813 VISIONS	A 8/T 7	A 8/T 2,3 7	A 8 -9/ T 7	A 8 9/T 8	A 8/T 2-3-7	A 8/T 2		A 4-8-9	A 5-8-9	A 8/T 7	A 8-9	A None/T 7
28	1 GRAD REQ 8 TEACHER EVAL	Generally there	Asst re 813 Im	Dist develped	Ongn asst prov	Tchrs prtcpte	Ongng asst to		T 2-3-4-7	T 2-5-7	Crt of adm &	T 7	All asst prov by
29	2 MCS 9 ADM TRAINING	was no ongoing	to adm dpt hds	cur & textbk	in kys prog ckh	in monthly in-	tchrs week to			Tchrs & adms like	eval tchrs resp	Other assistance	prin in pedgy.
30	3 TEXTBOOKS 10 SI PROGRAM	staff asstance	mis, rec min	selection	rel to dist gls	serv AB551/	non-stdnt			the new eval	to st/dist mndts	tends to be up-frnt	impr test scrs &
31	4 CAP 11 HOMEWORK	to implement	asst	Dist offers asst		Indv accrd	Adm mst be			system. Stated	Tchrs stf dev is	Mentors & Dept Ch	curr chng. test
32	5 SI QUAL REVW 12 10TH GR COUNSLG	813 reforms		in using guides		to py & [illegible]	cert to eval tch			that 813 gave	respons to tchrs	provide asst to	strat txt scrs cu
33	6 MENTOR TP 13 LONGER DY/YR	Dist states prob		Tchrs have grt		& relsd time	eval			old system some	felt need. Nther	tchrs on an "as	chng
34	7 STAFF DEV 14 QUAL INDICATORS	is lack of $		latitude to			MCS			teeth & made it	reltd to dist vis	needed or request	
35				adapt guides						more collegial		ed" basis	
36	RELATED TO OTHER DIST/SCHOOL VISIONS	CURR COHERENCE	Curr Coher	R/W ACROSS CUR	Tchr eval cln	Tchr eval			CAP IMPROVMT	WAYS TO REACH		INTEGRATG WRITG	
37		CLSRM MGT	Basc Skl Dev	EQUITY	supv basic/skl	MCS			LESSON DESIGN	LOW ACHIEVERS			
38			Tchr eval	COMPUTERS	dev	Inst Strat			SCHL CLIMATE	NEW CURR GUIDES			
39				STUDENT DISC						TCHR EVALUATN			
40	COMMENTS	There is a his-	Mst ongng asst	Tchrs & adm	Ongng ass avbl	Wd variety of	Ongng asst mini		There is a strong	The SIP program	No stf dev	The AB 551 progrm	Smll schl setting
41		toric lack of	gvn to dpt hd	not involved in	to all tchrs in	ongng asst to	if at all. Stf		commitment to	provides funding	prior to '84	is the vehicle that	mitigates against
42		staff developt	who ar in frnt	course determ	frm of kys prgm	hlp adm & tchr	dev prgm essnt		the Lesson De-	for most of the	Wht lite has	drives staff develp	formlzd and/or
43		in the district	lne of curr ref	ination or de-	Appears indrctl	integrate SB813	Up frnt/no on-		sign approach	upfront/ongoing	occrd is result	in the schl	struct staff dev
44		There is a lack	Mts & admin	velopment, CO	rel to SB 813	comp Fac well	going		to instruction	inservice train'g	of impetus frm	Staff development	& ongng asst
45		of cntrl office	also recv asst	curr exprts do		org to mke max			Extensive adm	There is strong	SB 813/very	is seen as the mean	funct assmd by
46		staff to guide	Maj of tchrs	all curr develp		use of St. dev			& tchr training	suport by tchrs o	litle ongng asst	for schl improvem	principal
47		ongoing asst	receive none	Dist offers no		opportunity			is provided as	dist's implementa	at this point	Other grant prog's	
48		Mentors have		routinized prog					ongoing support	practices		are also used	
49		been used for		for ongoing asst					to instructional	Staff develp be-		Chl, SCE, 803, 65	
50		curr devlpmt		There appears to					improvement	coming major way		and CTIIP	
51		Prop 13 given		be no ongoing					Minimal training	for schl improvmt		Most ongoing asst	
52		as reason for		asst developed					being provided	Additional classrm		comes from Dept	
53		reduced staff		for 813 reform					for HOTS	asst is needed		Chrs and informal	
54		devel attention		implementation								tchr networks	
55	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF C-T-I-T ASST	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW - MOD	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	LOW	LOW - MOD	MODERATE	MODERATE
56	DISTRICT ONGOING C-T-I-T ASSISTANCE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE
57	SCHOOL ONGOING C-T-I-T ASSISTANCE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MODERATE	MODERATE
58													
59	CAUSAL FACTOR M2 CONTENT, TIME INTENSITY, AND TYPE OF ONGOING ASSISTANCE				DATA SOURCE CAUSAL FACTORS, ROUND 1&2 CASE STUDIES AND POLICY DISCRIPTIONS								
60													
61													
62													
63													
64													

TABLE G9B CAUSAL FACTOR M2: CONTENT, TIME, INTENSITY, AND TYPE OF ONGOING ASSISTANCE

	1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1			BIG CITY		MEDIUM DISTHIGAN JHS AND MS								
2		(ADA: 646,500 - 44,014)			(ADA: 38,393 - 15,132)								
3	MAJOR AND SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS	East Bay MS	LA Metro MS							
4		A-Adm/T-Tch	A-Adm/T-Tchr	A-Adm/T-Tch	A-Adm/T-Tchr	A-Adm/T-Tchr							
5	EVIDENCE OF CONTENT ASSISTANCE	A: 8 (Tchr Evl)	A: 4,7,8	A:8 (Cln Suprv	A: 8	A:4,2,3,5,7							
6	1. MATH 5. SOCIAL STUDIES	T: 4 8	T: 1 4, 7,8	T: 3-4	T: 1-3-4-8	T:4-7-8							
7	2. SCIENCE 6. ESL	8-Clssrm Mgt	8- OSB III	T3:Wrtg Across	8-Adm req 8 hr	A4-Cln Tchng							
8	3. ENGLISH 7. TEST PREP	Student Disc	and cln suprv	Cur (Bay Area	of st. dev pr yr	and Cln Suprv							
9	4. GEN PEDAGOGY 8. OTHER	Schl Climate		Wrtg Proj &	Tchrs the crse	A8-Asrtv Disc							
10		No coherent		Local Univ)	In clsrm mngt	T4-Cln Tchg &							
11		prog for tchr		T4: Cln Tchg &		Lsn Design							
12		ongoing asst		TESA		T8-Asrtv Disc							
13	TIME OF ASSISTANCE		A: --/T: 3 yrs		A: 8 hrs/T:--								
14	LENGTH OF ONGOING ASSISTANCE	A:20hrs/T:3yr	A: --/T: --	A:23hrs/T:---	A:--/T:--	A:4.5d/T:4.5d							
15	WHEN DID IT BEGIN/END	A:---/T:85-88	A: 1/T: 1	A:--/T: 85---	A: 2/ T: 1, 2	1983-ongoing							
16	1. UPFRONT 2. ONGOING	A:1 / T:2		A:1 / T:1		A:2 / T:2							
17		T: AB 551		T:4min dys/yr		5 yrs ongoing							
18	INTENSITY OF ASSISTANCE		A: Mod/T: Mod		A: Mod/T: Mod	high trng prgm							
19	DEGREE OF INTENSITY		A: 3/T: 3	T: staff develp	A: 3/T: 3	A: 2-3							
20	1. INFORMAL 3. STRUCTURED	A: 3/T: 3	A: 2/T: 2	tends to be sk	A: 2,4/ T: 2,4	T: 2-3							
21	2. THOROUGH 4. SLIGHT	A: 4/T: 2		based and re									
22				to cur changes									
23	TYPE OF ASSISTANCE												
24	1. ACTUAL TRAINING 4. PROB SOLVG	Adm: 1-2-3	A: 1-2-3-4	A: ---/T:---		A:1-2-3							
25	2. STRUCTURED 5. INFORMAL	Tchr: 1-2-3-4	T: 1-2-3	Asst based on		T:1-2-3							
26	3. SCHEDULED 6. HAPHAZARD			annual needs									
27				assessment									
28	RELATED TO DIST/SCHOOL 813 VISIONS:	A:8/T:7	A: 8/ T: 2,3,7	A: 8 -8/ T: 7	A: 8/T: 2-3-7	A:4-8-9							
29	1. GRAD REQ 8. TEACHER EVAL	Generally there	Asst re SB 813	Dist develped	Ongng asst min	T:2-3-4-7							
30	2. MCS 9. ADM TRAINING	was no ongoing	ws prov to all	cur & textbk	fr adm, much fr								
31	3. TEXTBOOKS 10. SI PROGRAM	staff assiance	tchrs once pr	selection	tchrs, dist comm								
32	4. CAP 11. HOMEWORK	to implement	mo on shrtnd dy	Dist offers asst	partic. SIP Indng								
33	5. SI QUAL REVW 12. 10TH GR COUNSLG	813 reforms		in using guides	provides								
34	6. MENTOR TP 13. LONGER DY/YR	Dist states prob		Tchrs have grt									
35	7. STAFF DEV 14. QUAL INDICATORS	is lack of $		latitude to									
36				adapt guides									
37	RELATED TO OTHER DIST/SCHOOL VISIONS	CURCOHERENCE	instr. strategies	R/W ACRSS CUR	Curr refrm	CAP IMPROVMT							
38		STUDENT DISC	clsrm mngt	EQUITY	txtbk adopt.	LESSON DESIGN							
39		SCHL CLIMATE		COMPUTERS	Clsrm inst	SCHL CLIMATE							
40		CLSRM MGT		STUDENT DISC									
41	COMMENTS	There is a his-	Ext. stff dev in	Tchrs & adm	Wd var of stf	There is a strong							
42		toric lack of	R/W acrs curr/	not involved in	dev. available	commitment to							
43		staff develqpt	actve ongng asst	course determ-	sme tchrs	the Lesson De-							
44		in the district	prov by Engl dpt	ination or de-	partic. in BAWP	sign approach							
45		There is a lack	hd. Mth coor	velopment; CO	thru Dist. & SIP	to instruction							
46		of cntrl office	prov asst in	curr exprts do	counc. supp.	Extensive adm							
47		staff to guide	teaching HOTS	all curr develp	Staff develop	& tchr training							
48		ongoing asst		Dist offers no		is provided as							
49		Mentors have		routinized pro-		ongoing support							
50		been used for		gram for staff		to instructional							
51		curr devlpmt		development		improvement							
52		Prop 13 given		Publishers of		Minimal training							
53		as reason for		textbks pre-		being provided							
54		reduced staff		sent training		for HOTS							
55		devel attention											
56	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF C-T-I-T ASST:	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH							
57	DISTRICT ONGOING C-T-I-T ASSISTANCE	LOW	MODERATE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH							
58	SCHOOL ONGOING C-T-I-T ASSISTANCE	LOW	HIGH	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH							
59													
60	CAUSAL FACTOR M2: CONTENT, TIME INTENSITY AND TYPE OF ONGOING ASSISTANCE				DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS, ROUND 1 & 2 CASE STUDIES, AND POLICY STATEMENTS								
61													
62													
63													
64													
65													

TABLE G10 A CAUSAL FACTOR N: TEACHER EFFORT

	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17
1				BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM SUBURBAN			RURAL DISTRICTS	
2			(ADA 849,500 - 44,014)			(ADA: 30,393 - 30,850)				(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)			(ADA: 10,341 - 182)	
3	MAJOR COMP	SUB COMPONENT PARTS	Capital City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS
4														
5	EVIDENCE OF PHYSICAL ENGAGEMENT IN REFORM		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	DATA N/S	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
6		EFFORT TO ACHIEVE MASTERY	MIXED	MIXED	NO	YES	YES	MIXED		YES	YES	MIXED	YES	NO
7			Some highly	Lead teachers	Core curr is	Tchrs. serve	Mny tchrs vry	Sme vry inv;		All seem to	All tchrs work-	Varies by dpts.	Tchrs making a	Dnt see st. pol
8			involved and	deeply involved	implemented	on site comm	involved	others reluct.		work hard	ing hard		great deal of	as drving tchr
9			others not	Reg tchrs are	with little new	to dev. strat.							effort.	
10			interested	minimally to	skills needed	for gl. attain.								
11		EFFORT TO APPLY MASTERY	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
12				Lead tchrs	Some Eng and	PE/For Lang	Mny tchrs on	Sme Eng tchrs		State need to	Tchrs willing to	Tchr awrness	Changed courses	Lmtd knwldge
13				only	math tchrs	dpts have rev.	dist. lev. comm	appear working		be actively	use newly de-	still very	to match MCS	awrness limited
14					working hard	prgm to ach.	Dpt chrs initiated	hard in this		teaching dur-	veloped curr	limitd	Academic depts	
15						gls. effectively	timing, supp pgs	area		ring inst time	guides.		are implement'g	
16										and doing curr			the reforms	
17	EVIDENCE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFORT IN REFORM		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
18		INTEREST IN LEARNING SKILLS	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
19			Supportive of	Ld. tchrs only.	Need for train	Tchrs wrk on	Tchrs apply for	Supp. in-serv		Tchr effort is	Positive attitude	Int is presently	Tchrs attending	Lmtd tchr
20			inservice if	Reg tchrs see	ing is not felt	own tme	gmts, become	to prov awrness		high in terms	towards change	foc on CTIIP	state framework	awrnss of rel
21			related to sub	student as the	by teachers		mntr, dev. sch	& imp strats		of learning	by new and ex	MTchrs & MCS	conferences,	ramifications
22			ject area	problem.	Appears to be		stf activ. in			lesson design	perienced tchrs		national science	
23					time problem		support			& using it			conf, TECC , etc	
24		INTEREST IN APPLYING SKILLS	YES	YES	MIXED	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
25			Help other dist	Ld tchrs only	Tchrs report	Vols. prov a	Atnd conf,	Eng Tchrs resp		Ethos establish	Appears to be	Lck of awrness	Tchrs are imple-	Tchrs att wrk-
26			teachers	Reg tchrs see	would do more	Period tutor.	partic. in st.	to release tme		ed in district	high levels of	trg prvnts appl	menting the re-	shps, feel need
27				student as the	HOTS if had		comms	positively		re: importance	collaborative		forms in line w/	mre input
28				problem.	textbook that					of devel and	assistance re:		district timeline	
29					included them					using skills	skill applicat'n			
30		INTEREST IN REFINING SKILLS	MIXED	YES	NO	NO	YES	MIXED		YES	YES		YES	YES
31			Some enjoy	Ld tchrs only.		No evi of intrst	"Bat cht" sess	Tchrs recving		Appears to be	Tchrs receiving	Tchrs not at	Tchrs are attend	Tchrs feel nd
32			working with	Reg tchrs see		is cited	way to share	asst from dpt.		a high degree	assistance from	rfinement level	ing and present-	of mre wrkshps
33			colleagues to	student as the			nw ids about	chr. Attend		of commitment	adm, div hds,		ing at confer-	
34			review cur &	problem.			nw mater. or	conferences		to profession-	& inservice		ences.	
35			imp skills				strategies			al improvem't	training.			
36	EXAMPLES OF TEACHER EFFORT ACTIVITIES		Leaders in the	Tchrs att. stff	Eng tchrs dev	PE/For lang	Prt in comms;	Dpt. hd attnded				Cnsdrble intrst		Tchrs invld in
37			district called	dev. or work on	new writing	dpts modified	App for trng	UCI wrtng proj		Teachers state	Using new curr	in MCS compar	Writing for and	wrksp attend.
38			on to assist	school plan, but	program with	curr. & tch	grants	Mntr tchr supp		that courses	materials and	done at site by	recieveing spec-	
39			with cur proj	not committed	materials and	strategies				re: new skills	taking advan-	all tchrs	ial grants .	
40			affecting tchrs	to making plns	assessments.					are what they	tage of training			
41				effective						want & use.	opportunities.			
42	COMMENTS		Collective Barg			Tchrs intrstd	Tchrs vry int.	Ext. opp. for		Teachers are		To dte tchrs not	High numbers of	Vry lmtd int
43			re: inservice			but not rec.	and actively	insv, but no		learning to use		been askd to lrn	tchrs are attend-	in chnge or
44			w/out pay is	Ext. opp insuc		staff develop	seeking nw trng	cryovr to		more academ-		anything new	ing workshops &	reform
45			upsetting to	No monit. to			opportunities	clsrm		ically demand-			develop'g curr	
46			teachers	insure tchr ch						ing materials.				
47	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER EFFORT:		MIXED	MIXED	MIXED	MIXED	HIGH	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW
48			Effort reported	Ld tchrs dply		Effort is uneven	Tchr effor							
49			as uneven	involved -			appears fairly							
50				reg. tchrs not			widespread							
51														
52	DECISION RULES:													
53	Yes: Evidence supports components presence.													
54	No: Evidence does not support presence.													
55	Blank: Data not sufficient for classification.													
56	High: Most components are in place													
57	Moderate: At least half of the components are in place.													
58	Low: Less than half of the components are in place.													
59														
60														
61	CAUSAL FACTOR N: TEACHER EFFORT		DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS											
62														
63														
64														
65														

TABLE G10 B CAUSAL FACTOR N: TEACHER EFFORT

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1				BIG CITY			MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
2			(ADA:	640,500 - 44,014)			(ADA: 38,393 - 15,132)									
3	MAJOR COMP	SUBCOMPONENT PART	Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS		East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
4																
5	EVIDENCE OF PHYSICAL ENGAGEMENT IN REFOR		YES	YES/HIGH	YES		YES	YES								
6		EFFORT TO ACHIEVE MASTERY	YES	YES/HIGH	YES		YES	YES								
7			Soc Stdy tchrs	Tchrs learned	Tchrs state		Inservice Trng	Tchr effort is								
8			concerned re	SIP skills	district is		Classrm Mgt	high in terms								
9			quantity of	Workshops in	barrier to		Subject Area	of learning								
10			content	R/Writing	curr dev't.		awareness &	about lesson								
11				across curr			skill train'g	design.								
12		EFFORT TO APPLY MASTERY	YES/HIGH	YES/HIGH	YES		YES/HIGH	YES/HIGH								
13			Students given	Conducted need	Tchrs are mod		Tchr effor is	Tchrs accept								
14			CAP practice	assessment	ifying skills		widespread	ethos re active								
15			tests	with SIP for	as opposed		re curriculum	teaching, hard								
16			tchrs w/new	10 years	to learning		development	work, and get-								
17			text have a-	in-classroom	new ones.		Tchrs writing	ting through								
18			dapted instruc	assistance	For example:		grants to sup	curriculum.								
19			tion to class.	for R/Writ'g	Prob solv'g,		port imple-	Tchrs spend lots								
20			Schl wide dis-	across curr	probability,		mentation &	of time in								
21			cipline changed	Begin'g effort	& stat not		staff devel-	putting lesson								
22			traditional	to use test	viewed as a		opment (551)	design into								
23			tchr approach	scores	major change.			practice.								
24	EVIDENCE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFORT RE REFO		YES	YES/HIGH	YES		YES	YES								
25		INTEREST IN LEARNING SKILLS	YES	YES/HIGH	YES/LOW		YES	YES								
26			Great deal of	Attention given	Tchrs want		AB 551 grant	Tchrs state								
27			time re CAP	to HOTS devl	more time		written for	that hard work								
28			Attended disci-	2 tchrs needed	for curr		computer,	paid off in								
29			pline workshops	math retraing	development		math & sci.	student results								
30		INTEREST IN APPLYING SKILLS	YES	YES/HIGH	YES		YES	YES								
31			Preparing stud-	GATE teachers	tchrs state		Tchrs involved	Math teachers								
32			ents for CAP	commited to	new courses		in district	scheduled after								
33			Tchrs w/new	applying HOTS	do not re-		committees	school classes								
34			texts are mos	skills	quire new		for curr dev	to assist stud								
35			excited about	Qual indicators	skills; just		SIP Program	ents w/content								
36			curriculum	being used	modifications		in place									
37		INTEREST IN REFINING SKILLS	YES	YES	YES		NO	YES								
38			Want to main-	Math lab not	Tchrs have		New principal	Tchrs state that								
39			tain high CAP	closely inte-	been tradi-		in school &	teaching the								
40			expectations	grted w/class	tionally com-		little effort	new courses								
41			Meet w/HS tch	room tchrs	mited to high		attention has	have not re-								
42			re expectat'ns		standards		been given to	quired a great								
43					for students		refinement.	deal of effort.								
44	IDENTIFY EXAMPLES OF TEACHER EFFORT:		High activity in	Tchrs begin'g	Tchrs not act-		Attend conf	Implemented								
45			CAP prep	to use test	ing like they		Work on dist	lesson design								
46			95% involve-	scores for	are learning		committees	program								
47			ment in disci	curr improve	new program		Mentors tchrs									
48			pline program	ment.			Write grants									
49																
50	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER EFFORT:		MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE		MODERATE	HIGH								
51																
52	DECISION RULES:															
53	HIGH: Most of the critical components are in place															
54	MODERATE: At least half of the critical components are in place															
55	LOW: Fewer than half of the critical components are in place															
56	YES: Evidence supports component's presence															
57	NO. Evidence does not support component's presence															
58																
59	CAUSAL FACTOR N: TEACHER EFFORTS		DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS													
60																
61																
62																
63																
64																
65																

TABLE G11A CAUSAL FACTOR P SKILLS MASTERY

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1				BIG CITY			LARGE DISTRICTS					MEDIUM DISTRICTS				RURAL DISTRICTS		
2			(ADA 646,500 - 44,014))				(ADA 38,393 - 30,850)					(ADA 15,132 - 14,081)				(ADA 18,341 - 182)		
3	Major Comp	Sub Component Part	Capital City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS		Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS		LA Metro HS	Tri County HS		Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	
4																		
5	Skill Mastery		DK	NO	YES		NO	YES	YES	DATA N/A		YES	YES		NO	YES	YES	
6		Mastered curriculum content	DK	NO	YES		NO	YES	VARIED	DATA N/A		YES	YES		NA	YES	YES	
7		Mastered program process	YES	NO	YES		NO	YES				YES				YES	YES	
8	Staff Efficacy		YES	NO	YES		NO	YES	YES			YES	YES		NO	YES	YES	
9		Staff controlling innovation	YES	Y (LT) N (CT)	YES		NO	YES	YES LIMITED			YES			NA	YES	YES	
10		Staff doing routine implementation	YES	Y (LT) N (CT)	YES		NO	YES	YES LIMITED			YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	
11		Staff getting expected results	NA	NA	YES							YES			DK	YES		
12	Program Refinement and Integration (PR&I)		NA	NO	YES		NO	YES	YES			YES			NO	YES	YES	
13		Staff spending more time in PR&I	NA	NO	YES		NO	YES	NO			YES			NA	YES		
14		Staff involved in prog integration	NA	NO	YES		NO		YES LIMITED			YES			NA	YES		
15		Staff concerned with																
16		Achievement of Outcomes	NA	NO	NO		YES	YES				YES	YES			YES		
17		Additional training & support	NA		NO				YES			YES-HOTS	YES		YES	YES		
18		Loss of Program Priority	NA		NO											YES		
19																		
20	Component Variations																	
21		Time for skill mastery	NA				NA					5 YEARS	N/A		N/A	VARIES		
22		Measurement of skill mastery	NA				NA	Involvement	Teachers state			Review of	Teachers work-		Teacher non-	Teachers see	Staff sees	
23								in projects	they do not			lesson plans	ing on curr		participaton in	selves as part	close tie be	
24								Classroom	have ongoing			Observations	guides		staff develop-	ongoing change	tween 813	
25								observation	assistance o			Interviews	Eng Dept volun-		ment program	process	skills and	
26								and interv'v	sufficient			w/ tchrs &	teered to field		Administration	Teachers have	present	
27								High LoU	training			site adm	test CAP direct		lack of pressur	shifted concerns	abilities	
28									Tchrs state a				writing test		for program	to student	Staff states	
29									reluctance to				Adm statements		implementation	impact issues	commitment	
30									change								is to school	
31		Post-mastery activities	NA				NA	Attention to				Expand to					improvem't	
32								eval & de-				HOTS					and not just	
33								gree of use									to SB 813	
34	Overall Assessment of Degree of Skill Mastery																	
35		School	NA	LOW MOD	MODERATE		LOW	HIGH	LOW	NA		HIGH	MODERATE		LOW	HIGH	LOW MOD	
36																		
37	Comments			Lead Teachers	Skill emphasis		Users have	Mastery will	Dept chairs			Trad crses,	Teachers using		Skill compari-	School and Dist	Math tchr	
38				(LT) & Dept	on tchg basic		not yet	vary across	play key role			pedagogy	curr guides,		sons being in-	process for re-	using 20 yr	
39				Chairs are	skills, com		developed	faculty	in helping w/			mastered	MCS, & frame-		itiated between	form is in place	old txtbook	
40				better skilled	CAI, and a		mastery &	Gen mastery	skill mastery			Not Mastered	works		courses and	Change process		
41	Decision Rules			& more ac-	writing prog		are working	of curr con-	Mentors & ex-			HOTS	Teachers teach		MCS	has been difficult		
42	HIGH Data indicated 3rd wave status			cepting of the	Prog vision		towards it	tent & class	ternal consult			Novel ready	core curr based		Program lang-	to implement	New Eng tchr	
43	MODERATE Data indicated 2nd wave status			the reforms	developed			management	help w/ staff			Content area	on new stand-		uage not noted	An environment	replced highly	
44	LOW Data indicated 1st wave status			than classrm	through SIP			Attention is	training			reading	ards		in teacher-adm	for improvement	skilled tchr	
45	NA Not assessed by data gatherer			teachers (CT)	General atti			shifting to	New principal			Inquiry	Adm feels ad-		discussions	has been estab-	New Eng tchr	
46	DK Data gatherer did not know				tude of skill			program ef-	who is not			approaches	ditional train-			lished	has not yet	
47	YES Data gatherer provided evidence				mastery			fectiveness	considered			Cooperative	ing needed to			There is heavy	developed	
48	NO Data gatherer did not provide evidence							High number	an expert			learning	assist tchrs			teacher involve	skills mastery	
49								have attained	Studs state			Situational	w/mastery			ment in reforms		
50								mastery of	tchrs use lect			lessons						
51								new curr	method									
52								content &	Tchrs do not									
53								clsrm mngt	hve repertoire									
54									of models of									
55									tchng									
56									Tchrs do not									
57									attmpt to chng									
58									mode of									
59									instruction									
60																		
61	CAUSAL FACTOR P SKILLS MASTERY		DATA SOURCE CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS															
62																		
63																		
64																		
65																		

TABLE G11 B CAUSAL FACTOR P: SKILL MASTERY

	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	14	15	16	17
1															
2				BIG CITY		MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
3	Major Comp	Sub Component Part	(ADA:	646,500 -	44,014)	(ADA: 38,393 -	15,132)								
4			Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS	East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
5	Skill Mastery		(see comments)	YES	YES	NO	YES								
6		Mastered curriculum content	DK	YES	YES	NO	YES								
7		Mastered program process	DK	YES	YES	NO	YES								
8	Staff Efficacy		YES	YES	YES	NO	YES								
9		Staff controlling innovation	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES								
10		Staff doing routine implementation	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES								
11		Staff getting expected results	YES		YES		YES								
12	Program Refinement and Integration (PR&I)														
13		Staff spending more time in PR&I	YES		YES	NO	YES								
14		Staff involved in prog integration		YES	YES	NO	YES								
15		Staff concerned with:													
16		Achievement of Outcomes	YES	YES	NO		YES								
17		Additional training & support	YES	YES	NO		YES - HOTS								
18		Loss of Program Priority			NO										
19															
20	Component Variations:														
21		Time for skill mastery	NA	10yr SIP											
22		Measurement of skill mastery	Type of assist	Experience as		Nature of	Observations								
23			ance provided	SIP school		skill train'g	& interviews								
24			teachers has	SIP process		Classroom	Classroom								
25			been minimal	has been		observation	observations								
26			District has not	internalized		Individual	Individual								
27			yet initiated	Staff develop		interviews	interviews								
28			evaluation of	ment for											
29			reform effort	read/writ'g											
30			Observ & Interv	across curr											
31		Post mastery activities	Tchrs look to				Expand to								
32			univ resources				HOTS								
33			for skill devel												
34	Overall Assessment of Degree of Skill Mastery														
35		School	DK	MODERATE	HIGH	LOW	HIGH								
36															
37	Comments:		Level of skill	SI has been	Teachers not	Few teachers	Teachers use								
38			mastery could	internalized	required to	demonstrate	district plan								
39			not be assess	Gr req were	learn new	mastery of	initial stages:								
40			ed	routinely	set of skills	new curr	of mastery:								
41			Tchrs express	implemented	due to 813	course out-	HOTS								
42			confidence in	Few teachers	Teachers not	lines.	New science								
43			ability to tran	need math	required to	Tchrs receive	New soc std								
44			slate reforms	& science	use differ-	4-5 days	Readg in con								
45			into practice	training	ent peda-	training in	tent area								
46			Tchrs using HOT	Read/writing	gogy due to	classrm mg	Writing Skills								
47			and problem	across curr	SB 813	No uniform	Cooperative								
48			solving skills	skills devel	Tchrs not re-	direction for	learning								
49			in classroom	oped & used	quired to	next steps.	Situational								
50			Tchrs do not	HOT skills be	learn new		lessons								
51			look to site	developed b	subject mat		Tchrs in new								
52			adm for help	some tchrs	ter content		content areas								
53				Test-curr	Non subject		are develop'g								
54				articulation	area majors		content skills								
55				started	or minors		Most teachers								
56				Qual ind used	are excpt'n		beginnig to								
57							use previous								
58							HOT training								
59															
60															
61															
62	CAUSAL FACTOR P: SKILLS MASTERY		DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS												
63															
64															
65															

TABLE G12 A CAUSAL FACTOR Q COMMITMENT

1	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17
		BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS		MEDIUM DISTRICTS		RURAL DISTRICTS			RURAL	
MAJOR AREAS/SUBCOMPONENTS	(ADA 648,500 44,014)			(ADA: 30,393 - 30,050)		(ADA: 15,132 - 14,091)		(ADA: 18,241 - 182)				
	Capital City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri County HS	Buffalo Butte	Central Valley High	NorCal High
PSYCHOLOGICAL COMMITMENT	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	DATA N/S	YES	YES	YES LIMITED	YES	YES
PROGRAM CONTRIBUTION	YES Instructional Improvement	MCS Textbooks HOTS CAP preparation Clinical Supr	YES 813 is not seen as new program	YES MCS HS Grad Req Inst Supervision	YES	VARIES Many teachers state a reluctance to change. Dept Chair is change agent		YES Inst Improv't Staff Dev CAP testing Course Dev	YES Alignment of MCS & curr Coordination w/ other HS Staff Dev	YES LIMITED MCS and Curr alignment	YES	YES
PROGRAM EXPANSION	YES 10th Counseling				YES	DK		YES CAP Integratn	YES Seen as means for change	NO	YES Dist/schl concern due to proposed cuts in state $	
INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT	YES	YES						YES	YES	DK		YES Commitment no to "SB 813"
DISTRICT SUPPORT	MIXED $ Not Budgeted Staff skeptical of dist commitment to staff developement	YES		YES	YES	YES External consultants used w/ English workshop		YES	YES	GUARDED	YES	YES
SCHOOL SUPPORT	YES Generally NO Mentor TP	YES-HOTS NO-Qual Ind NO MCS	YES	YES	YES	VARIES Lack of ongoing assistance Workshops conducted		YES- General YES Rigor NO Mentor	YES	YES Enthusiastic support of AP & Dept Ch Prin & staff give guarded support	YES	YES
REASONS FOR COMMITMENT	Parent Support	Prof Commitment Teacher ownership	Prof success Adm support	Prin's focus on reform Prin's leadership Staff sees student benefits from program	Supt priority Dist mission Schl mission Goal to increase ed quality National & state issue Funding	Dept chairs are leaders Staff support release time for training		Results of improvemts & increased CAP scores Programs increase student responsibility.	Staff sees prog benefits Staff sees changes in climate and culture. Increase in student attendance.	Concerned abou community publicity Asst Prin is interested INTERESTED Asst Prin has limited curr skills	Tchr involvement Schl ownership of reform effort Schl sees student benefits Climate of professionalism exists	Commitment is to students rather than to a state progra Pressure to prepare students for college Internal LOC for Schl improvm
DEMONSTRATION OF COMMITMENT	Enthusiasm of administration	Sme tchrs lck sense of commit tchrs not usng skls prsntd at workshop	Staff works ovrtm tchrs dont respct dist curr spec tchrs feel seprt frm dec mkng pw	5 year plan as guide	Established dist/schl goal Team effort Staff talk	New administration is working to build trust with staff		Adm's enthusiasm Discusion of strategies for CAP tes preperation.	Increased staff professionalism and curriculum alignment with other HS.	Prin exhibits support for program	Adm eval training being conducted CAP committee in place CTIIP used for reforms	Counselor puts pressure on CP students Parents support CP emphasis
OVERALL ASSESMENT OF COMMITMENT												
DISTRICT LEVEL	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	NA	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE
SCHOOL LEVEL	MODERATE	LOW	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	NA	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	HIGH
CAUSAL FACTOR Q COMMITMENT	DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS											

TABLE 13 A CAUSAL FACTOR R EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	12	13	15	16	17	18
1				BIG CITY		LARGE DISTRICTS				MEDIUM DISTRICTS			RURAL DISTRICTS		
2			(ADA 646,500 - 44,014)			(38,393 - 30,850)				(ADA 15,132 - 14,091)			(ADA 10,341 - 187)		
3			Capital City HS	LA City HS	SoCal HS	Desert HS	East Bay HS	Orange Co HS	Peninsula HS	LA Metro HS	Tri-County HS	Buffalo Butte HS	Central Valley HS	Norcal HS	
4															
5	EXTENT OF SB 813 IMPLEMENTATION		OK	50 60 %	(Data N/S)	(Data N/S)	60 70%		(DATA N/S)	100%	Varies w/Prog	LIMITED	"VERY HIGH"	DATA N/A	
6															
7	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REFORMS		All teachers	Established a			Participating	Counseling		District wide	Implemented	Beginning to use	100% in alignment	Private change	
8			implementing	2 year plan			teachers are	Prog success-		use of core	Longer day	MCS for course	of curr plan	[illegible] gr. grd	
9			new curr	School atten-			using prog's	ful and insti-		cur & lesson	Mentor Tchr	comparisons	Math & prog	req. CAP tstng.	
10			New evaluation	dance prog in			90% of time	tutionalized		design	Cash for CAP's	Only Eng tests	Eng dept 100%	[illegible]	
11			procedures	place and has			Spec Pop's	Mentors are		New science	Counseling Prog	selected using	Science has take	cont - goal ind	
12			working	parent help			prog not wel	curr develop-		& soc studies	Inc Grad Req	MCS	Soc Studies has	focus Ment [illegible]	
13			10 Gr Counsel	Achievement			integrated	ers		courses bein	Teacher Eval	Most teachers	has scan & going	maj curr chnge	
14			ing Program	gains are			Cur reforms	Adm training		implemented	w/out train'g	going through	Spec Pop's are	for 7 years	
15			in place	moderate			implemented	in progress		AP courses	Textbook Sel	staff dev train	being considered		
16			Enhanced artic-	Instruction has			extensively	Strengthening		established	action	ing program	implemented	Spec Pops	
17			ulation with	not been sig				curr & CAP		Initial stages	Ongoing Curr	indications of	Inc Grad Req	integrtd into	
18			feeder schls	improved				are priorities		HOT's	revision pro-	increased sup	Tests Selection	core curr	
19				Math/Sci cur				Initial training		Math/Sci	cess in place	port by district	Model Curr Stand	HOTS attentn	
20				changes				established &		CAP changes	CAP testing	Teacher evalua	CAP Testing	Staff develop	
21				Dist curr guide				ongoing in low		Full imple-	program	tion system be	Quality Indicator	Strng counselng	
22				more import				District office		mentation		ing introduced	Counseling Prog		
23				ant than MCS				has invested		Discipline		Increased HS	Mentor Tchr prog		
24				Curr/testing				energy for		Key improve-		graduation req			
25				alignment is				reforms		ments are at		in place			
26				being done to						full imple-		Course content			
27				mixed degree						mentation		changes being			
28				CE are partial						stage		made			
29				ly implem'd						HOT's mixed		Adj for Spec Pop			
30	CURRICULUM REFORM		YES	YES			YES	YES		YES	YES	YES-LOW	YES	YES	
31		COURSE CONTENT CHANGE	YES	YES			YES	YES		YES	YES	YES-LOW	YES	YES	
32		COURSE QUALITY CHANGE	IN PROCESS	YES			YES	YES		YES			YES	YES&LIMITED	
33		SPECIAL POP'S INTEGRATION	NO	YES			YES-LIMITED			YES-LIMITED		YES	YES	YES	
34	INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT		YES	YES			YES	YES		YES-LIMITED	YES	YES-LOW	YES	YES	
35		HIGHER ORDER THINKING	YES	IN PROCESS						Beginning			YES-LIMITED	YES&LIMITED	
36		ONGOING STAFF DEVELOPMENT						YES-LIMITED		YES	YES-LIMITED		YES-LIMITED	YES&LIMITED	
37	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION IMPROVEMENT		YES	OK			OK	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
38		ADM IMPLEMENTATION	YES					YES			YES	YES	YES	YES	
39															
40	OVERALL LEVEL OF EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION														
41		DISTRICT	MODERATE	MODERATE		HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE		MOD-HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	
42		SCHOOL	MODERATE	MODERATE		HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE		MOD-HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MODERATE	
43															
44															
45															
46															
47															
48	CAUSAL FACTOR R EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION			DATA SOURCE CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS											
49															
50															
51															
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															
66															

TABLE 13 B CAUSAL FACTOR R: EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1															
2				BIG CITY		MEDIUM DISTRICTS									
3			(ADA	646,500 - 44,014)		(ADA: 38,393 - 15,132)									
4			Capitol City MS	LA City JHS	SoCal JHS	East Bay MS	LA Metro MS								
5	EXTENT OF SB 813 IMPLEMENTATION														
6			Varies	30 60 %	DATA N/S	60 %	100%								
7	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REFORMS														
8			New curr being	More demand-		Participating	District-wide								
9			implemented	ing cur based		teachers use	use of core								
10			Math	on higer grad		prog 90%	cur & lesson								
11			Science	requirements		of the time.	design.								
12			Social Studies	is in place.		Spec Pop's	New science								
13			Reading	Read/writing		programs no	& soc studies								
14			Writing	across curr		integrated	courses being								
15			Prog designed	implemented		well w/ core	implemented								
16			to improve	by 80% tchr.		curriculum.	initial stages								
17			inst supervis'n	HOT's imple-		Cur reform	HOT's								
18			has had no	mented by		is being imp-	Math/Sci								
19			effect.	30% tchrs.		lemented	CAP changes								
20			Critical thinkin	Math Lab ful-		extensively.	Full imple-								
21			is priority.	ly in place.		Test taking	mentation:								
22			Initial training:	Textbook sel		stragies for	Assertive								
23			HOT's	lection re:		CAP & SAT	Discipline								
24			Classroom Mg	MCS limited		are included	Collegial								
25			Critical thinkin	OI use well			Environm								
26			program being	developed.			Key Improve								
27			implemented.				ments are at								
28							full imple-								
29							mentation								
30	CURRICULUM REFORM		YES	YES			stage.								
31		COURSE CONTENT CHANGE	YES	YES		YES	YES								
32		COURSE QUALITY CHANGE	YES	YES		YES	YES								
33		SPECIAL POP'S INTEGRATION					YES-LIMITED								
34	INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT		YES	YES		YES-LIMITED	YES								
35		HIGHER ORDER THINKING	YES	YES			YES								
36		ONGOING STAFF DEVELOPMEN					YES-LIMITED								
37	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION IMPROVEMEN		YES LIMITED				YES								
38		ADM IMPLEMENTATION					YES								
39							YES								
40	OVERALL LEVEL OF EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION														
41		DISTRICT	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	LOW	MOD HIGH								
42		SCHOOL	MODERATE	MODERATE	NA	MODERATE	MOD HIGH								
43															
44															
45															
46															
47	CAUSAL FACTOR R: EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION			DATA SOURCE: CAUSAL FACTOR SHEETS											
48															
49															
50															
51															
52															
53															
54															
55															
56															
57															
58															
59															
60															
61															
62															
63															
64															
65															

Appendix H

Special-Needs Students Program Characteristics

TABLE H1-A: REMEDIAL/LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2			BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS
3	REMEDIAL/LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS		CAPITOL CITY HIGH SCHOOL	L.A. CITY HIGH SCHOOL	SOCAL HIGH SCHOOL
4					
5	CONCEPT OF SERVICES		Not adequately addressed at the school	Provide remed. help on short term base only;	School does not recognize a remed. track/group
6				remedial students mainstreamed into regular	
7				program asap; basic skills instruction to assist	
8				in passing district proficiency	
9					
10	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		Proposed reduction or elim. of academic &	After-school tutoring & peer tutoring;	No special instructional assistance offered
11			counseling services due to dist. fiscal crisis	Saturday on a volunteer base	
12			& collective bargaining difficulties		
13					
14	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Not addressed	Tutoring specific to student academic need	Tutoring available to all; evidence that curr.
15					scope and sequence is lacking in courses designed
16					for minimum proficiencies
17					
18	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE		Proposed reduction or elimination of various	Very few changes in the program;	Focus on basic skills w/ establishment of writing
19	LAST FOUR YEARS		services which will affect remedial and	summer school reinstated two years ago	across curriculum, study skills lab, tutoring,
20			low achieving students		individualized computer prgrm availabe to all,
21					not specifically for the low achieving
22					
23					
24					
25					
26			LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS
27	REMEDIAL/LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS		DESERT HIGH SCHOOL	EAST BAY HIGH SCHOOL	ORANGE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL
28					
29	CONCEPT OF SERVICES		To raise students' expectations and achieve-	For most part, services geared to academically	To afford assistance thru specifically designed
30			ment	oriented and/or college bound students	courses that will help students pass district
31					proficiency tests
32					
33	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		Reading/writing & math labs provided	No overall schl plan; is special counseling	Summer schl program focused on basic skills &
34			mainly by Chapter 1 funds	program to assist students	district proficiency tests; Developmental
35					mathematics and English offered
36					
37	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Aligned with regular program, but not to	Some effort to modify curric. & instruction	Developmental course offerings aligned with core
38			depth of regular core curriculum		curric. to assist in passing the proficiency tests
39					
40	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE		Heavy emphasis on providing assistance to	Special counseling program & attempts to	Summer school changed from extensive elective
41	LAST FOUR YEARS		low achieving students	increase parent contact	program to one offering only district proficiency
42					classes
43					
44					
45					
46			LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	MEDIUM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	MEDIUM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS
47	REMEDIAL/LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS		PENINSULA HIGH SCHOOL	L.A. METRO HIGH SCHOOL	TRI-COUNTY HIGH SCHOOLS
48					
49	CONCEPTS OF SERVICES		No specially designated "remedial" track	General fund monies used to establish a	To provide remedial students with instructional
50			student; differentiation in various	remedial reading prgm that would assist	opportunities that will upgrade their academic
51			academic departments	students in passing district proficiences	performance
52					
53	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		Intensive skills lab for students below	Identified students take remedial reading	A new "bridges" program established to
54			grade level in reading	instead of elective courses	transition students out of remedial track
55					
56	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM			Supports the regular program	All students are expected to master the
57					regular curriculum
58					
59	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE		Focus on raising teacher expectation of	Focus to improve general curriculum as well	Greater emphasis placed on helping students
60	LAST FOUR YEARS		student achievement & to increase	as to improve performance of low achievers	"bridge" into higher level courses; students
61			mainstreaming of special needs students		encouraged to take higher level courses
62					
63					
64					
65			RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS
66	REMEDIAL/LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS		BUFFALO BUTTE HIGH SCHOOL	CENTRAL VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL	NORCAL HIGH SCHOOL
67					
68	CONCEPT OF SERVICES		To identify remedial/low achieving students	To provide remediation for students below	To identify & provide remediation for
69			& mainstream them back into regular prgm	the 40th percentile	students scoring below 24th percentile on CTBS
70					
71	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		Focus on basic skills through remedial	Mathematics & reading labs: 40-60 minutes of	Greater flexibility in tracking, remedial &
72			English, Mathematics & Science; Develop-	computer assisted instruction per week;	proficiency content area classes, tutoring; close
73			mental Reading & resource classroom part	emphasis on teaching mastery	monitoring by the counselor
74			of system		
75					
76	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Remedial content area classes support the	Supports regular program by teaching skills in	Supports regular program by offering additional
77			regular program through basic skills	context rather than in isolation	classes focusing on student needs
78			development		
79					
80	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE		More sections of remedial content area	New personnel hired for mathematics lab;	No program available before the reform
81	LAST FOUR YEARS		classes offered to satisfy grad requirements	revision of the mathematics/reading lab	
82			increased funds for books for Developmental	curriculum to align with regular program;	
83			Reading made available; upgrading of the	student recognition prgm for improvement;	
84			general science course	computers to support instructional program	
85					
86					
87					
88					
89					
90					
91					
92					

TABLE H1 B: REMEDIAL LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS - JUNIOR HIGH AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2						
3	REMEDIAL OR LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS		URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	
4			CAPITOL CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	L.A. CITY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	SOCAL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	
5	CONCEPT OF SERVICES					
6			Because of small percentage of remedial	No formal program offered	To improve student performance by	
7			students, concept is not well defined		eliminating tracking and maintaining	
8					higher expectations for students	
9	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED					
10			Small class size with teacher-designed	Basic classes are available in English	Reading lab or basic mathematics are	
11			program; emphasis on moving students	and mathematics	offered to those below grade level	
12			through the various levels and rewarding			
13			them			
14	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM					
15			Remedial services in mathematics and	Curriculum is the same, but students do	There is alignment with various courses	
16			language skills/reading are aligned with the	not receive the depth that students in	being offered as prerequisites to the	
17			core curriculum	the regular program do	regular core curriculum	
18	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM IN THE					
19	LAST FOUR YEARS		CAP scores in mathematics have improved	No substantial changes	No substantial changes	
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25	REMEDIAL OR LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS		SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS		
26			EAST BAY JUNIOR HIGH	L.A. METRO MIDDLE SCHOOL		
27	CONCEPT OF SERVICES					
28			New SIP monies to focus on low achievers	To focus students on learning basic		
29			next year			
30	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED					
31			Remedial language arts and mathematics	Intensive instruction in language arts and		
32			classes for those who do not pass district	mathematics; remedial reading and		
33			seventh grade proficiency	mathematics lab provided		
34	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM					
35				Same goals and objectives as the		
36				regular program		
37	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE					
38	LAST FOUR YEARS			New state focus on a broader and deeper		
39				curriculum initiated		
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						
50						
51						
52						
53						
54						
55						
56						
57						
58						
59						
60						
61						
62						
63						
64						
65						
66						
67						
68						
69						
70						
71						
72						
73						
74						
75						
76						
77						
78						
79						
80						
81						
82						
83						
84						
85						
86						
87						
88						
89						
90						
91						
92						

TABLE H2 A: CHAPTER I AND STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS - HIGH SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2						
3	CHAPTER 1 OR STATE (EIA/SCE)		BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	
4	COMPENSATORY PROGRAM		CAPITOL CITY HIGH SCHOOL	L.A. CITY HIGH SCHOOL	SOCAL HIGH SCHOOL	
5						
6	CONCEPT OF SERVICES		Reduction of funds resulted in elimination			
7			of personnel serving federal and state	No Chapter I or compensatory education	No Chapter I or compensatory education	
8			categorical programs	program	program	
9						
10	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		Not adequately addressed			
11						
12	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Lack of coherent plan for integration of			
13			services			
14						
15	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE		Reduction in program			
16	LAST FOUR YEARS					
17						
18						
19						
20	CHAPTER 1 OR STATE (EIA/SCE)		LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	
21	COMPENSATORY PROGRAM		DESERT HIGH SCHOOL	EAST BAY HIGH SCHOOL	ORANGE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	
22						
23	CONCEPT OF SERVICES		To increase expectations for students and			
24			provide supplementary academic services	No Chapter 1 or compensatory education	No Chapter 1 or compensatory education	
25			within the realm of Chapter 1 funding; 68%	program	program	
26			of students eligible for Chapter 1 assistance			
27						
28	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		Before or after-school tutoring; bilingual			
29			support lab; reading/writing and			
30			mathematics labs			
31						
32	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Supports the regular program			
33						
34	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE		Implementation of after-school and lunch			
35	LAST FOUR YEARS		time tutoring program; use of labs			
36			integrated into the students' regular			
37			schedule; more integrated language arts			
38			program with emphasis on writing			
39						
40						
41						
42						
43	CHAPTER 1 OR STATE (EIA/SCE)		LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	MEDIUM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	MEDIUM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS	
44	COMPENSATORY PROGRAM		PENINSULA HIGH SCHOOL	L.A. METRO HIGH SCHOOL	TRI-COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	
45						
46	CONCEPT OF SERVICES		No Chapter 1 or compensatory education			
47			program	No secondary school Chapter 1 Compensatory	No secondary school Chapter 1 or	
48				education program	Compensatory education program	
49	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED					
50						
51	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM					
52						
53	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE					
54	LAST FOUR YEARS					
55						
56						
57						
58	CHAPTER 1 OR STATE (EIA/SCE)		RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS	
59	COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS		BUFFALO BUTTE HIGH SCHOOL	CENTRAL VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL	NORCAL HIGH SCHOOL	
60						
61	CONCEPT OF SERVICES					
62			No Chapter 1 or state; compensatory	To build functional level skills and provide	To develop a program of instruction in	
63			education program	a foundation for extending and applying	language arts that will increase student	
64				basic skills	achievement	
65	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED					
66				Mathematics and reading lab with emphasis	Remedial English and regular English required;	
67				on study skills, test taking, problem solving	students supported by additional classes	
68				and critical thinking	focusing on skill needs	
69	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM					
70				Supports the regular program	Supports the regular program	
71	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE					
72	LAST FOUR YEARS					
73				Mathematics lab curriculum broadened;	No major changes	
74				instructional assistants provide more		
75				individualized help		
76						
77						
78						
79						
80						
81						
82						
83						
84						
85						
86						
87						
88						
89						
90						
91						
92						

TABLE H2 B: CHAPTER 1 AND STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS - JUNIOR HIGH AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2						
3	CHAPTER 1 OR STATE (EIA/SCE)		URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	
4	COMPENSATORY PROGRAM		CAPITOL CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	L.A. CITY JUNIOR HIGH	SOCAL JUNIOR HIGH	
5						
6	CONCEPT OF SERVICES					
7			No Chapter 1 or compensatory education	No Chapter I or compensatory education	More than 50% of student population	
8			program	program	receive Chapter 1 services. Program	
9					focus is to bring up the bottom quartile	
10	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED					
11					An instructional aide provided in all	
12					Chapter 1 classes; part-time reading	
13					teacher to address reading deficiences;	
14					computers and counselors to support	
15					the instructional program	
16	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM					
17					Supports the regular program	
18	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE					
19	LAST FOUR YEARS				No major changes; after-school basic	
20					skills homework lab recently developed	
21						
22						
23	CHAPTER 1 OR STATE (EIA/SCE)		SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS		
24	COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS		EAST BAY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	LA METRO MIDDLE SCHOOL		
25						
26	CONCEPT OF SERVICES					
27			No Chapter 1 or State Compensatory	No Chapter 1 or state (EIA/SCE)		
28			Education Program	compensatory education program		
29	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED					
30						
31	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM					
32						
33	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE					
34	LAST FOUR YEARS					
35						
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						
50						
51						
52						
53						
54						
55						
56						
57						
58						
59						
60						
61						
62						
63						
64						
65						
66						
67						
68						
69						
70						
71						
72						
73						
74						
75						
76						
77						
78						
79						
80						
81						
82						
83						
84						
85						
86						
87						
88						
89						
90						
91						
92						

TABLE H3 A: BILINGUAL AND/OR LEP STUDENTS - HIGH SCHOOLS

1	3	4	5	6
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND/OR BILINGUAL EDUCATION	BIG CITY URBAN SCHOOLS CAPITOL CITY HIGH SCHOOL	BIG CITY URBAN SCHOOLS L.A. CITY HIGH SCHOOL	BIG CITY URBAN SCHOOLS SOCAL HIGH SCHOOL	
CONCEPT OF SERVICES	Not adequately addressed	To integrate students into the core curriculum as soon as possible; English emphasis	Small linguistically diverse LEP population of 38 students programed into the basic school track with English only instruction; no formalized plan for LEP students	
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED	Proposed reduction in services	Experimental/High Intensity English arts program with sheltered ESL content area classes which are not as demanding as the core classes; Transitional Program adjusts work to meet the students' needs	ESL at a variety of levels is offered; American literature designed for LEP students is offered to meet the graduation requirement; no extra help in core curriculum given	
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Traditional instruction aligned to provide basic skills necessary for LEP students to meet the demands of the core curriculum	Students are expected to master the core curriculum which is taught in English	
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS	Proposed reduction or elimination of services due to district fiscal crisis	Increased number of Spanish speaking students causing an expansion of ESL counseling and general office staff; more active parent participation; extensive counseling program offered	Minority students underrepresented in higher level classes; focus on college-prep students	
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND/OR BILINGUAL EDUCATION	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS DESERT HIGH SCHOOL	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS EAST BAY HIGH SCHOOL	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS ORANGE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOLS	
CONCEPT OF SERVICES	To provide instructional assistance that will assist students to mainstream into the regular program as soon as possible	Due to the small number of LEP students, almost no consideration given to the needs of the program in the overall reform initiative	To provide services to mainstream students into the regular as quickly as possible	
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED	"Sheltered" English content area classes with bilingual assistants to provide primary language support when needed; tutoring in the bilingual support lab; development of instructional materials and texts appropriate to the need	District traveling teacher and instructional aide service students two periods a day; ESL classes designed to accommodate students' English language proficiency	High Intensity English Language (HILT) classes offered to beginning students; "Sheltered" English content area classes offered in some curricular areas; instructional assistants in some classes	
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM	Supports the regular program	Some effort to align the curriculum but students are expected to master the core curriculum using the same materials as English only students	Supports the regular program; adjustments made in the delivery of content information to accommodate the students	
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS	Development of the bilingual support lab; addition of "sheltered" English content area classes	More focused on skills needed to pass the CAP test; ESL component added to summer school	More ESL classes being offered; "Sheltered" English content area classes established; course outlines developed to align the ESL classes with the core curriculum	
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND/OR BILINGUAL EDUCATION	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS PENINSULA HIGH SCHOOLS	MEDIUM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS L.A. METRO HIGH SCHOOL	MEDIUM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS TRI-COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL	
CONCEPT OF SERVICES	306 out of 706 students identified as LEP; Not all are enrolled in ESL or "Sheltered" English classes	Strong ESL and basic skills focus using a common teaching strategy of direct instruction to improve students' linguistic and academic performance	Focus on basic skills using English only approach	
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED	Six levels of ESL offered; Sheltered English classes are based on school-devised criterion reference test; Title VII monies for aides and after-schools tutoring	Various levels of ESL accommodate students' acquisition of English; bilingual aide in same content classes	"Sheltered" English program offered	
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM	Curriculum is the same as the regular program	Very strong efforts made to integrate curriculum with the regular program; common teaching strategy of direct instruction is aligned with regular program	Curriculum is the same as the core curriculum with supplementary material/texts to support instruction	
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS	Elimination of bilingual classes since 1983-84	District moving towards "sheltered" English classes	Elimination of pull-out program; more concentrated effort to move students into the regular program	
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND/OR BILINGUAL EDUCATION	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS BUFFALO BUTTE HIGH SCHOOL	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS CENTRAL VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS NORCAL HIGH SCHOOL	
CONCEPT OF SERVICES	To integrate students into regular program asap through a structured immersion English program	To provide services to mainstream LEP students into regular program as soon as possible	To integrate students into regular program asap through an immersion program	
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED	Careful monitoring of LEP students by counselor; LEP students placed in regular class at level commensurate with the their skill level	Bilingual aide and/or bilingual teacher service students in ESL lab; Mathematics and reading lab offered as well as regular and remedial classes	Intensive ESL instruction offered; in class tutoring; bilingual studies class to assist with academic progress	
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM	LEP students have same curriculum, receive tutoring when needed	Program provides basic skills foundation & English language support to meet requirements of regular program	Aligned with and supports regular program	
CHANGES IN THE PROGAM OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS	LEP population increasing & school needs to institute a formal plan to meet legal state requirement for these students	Three hour intensive English for beginning level students offered in a special independent Study class; New math program under development		

TABLE H3 B: LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND/OR BILINGUAL EDUCATION JUNIOR HIGH AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS

1	2	3	4	5
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND/OR BILINGUAL EDUCATION		URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS CAPITOL CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS L.A. CITY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS SOCAL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
CONCEPT OF SERVICES		No bilingual/ESL program as less than 2% of the students are LEP	Emphasis on English acquisition to enhance academic success; mainstream students into the regular program as soon as possible	Emphasis on English acquisition to enhance academic success; mainstream students into regular program as soon as possible
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED			Provide appropriate language instruction based on students' linguistic need	"Sheltered" English content area classes with instructional assistants who speak the students' native language are offered
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM			Students receive the core curriculum with program delivery adjusted for the level of the student	Students receive the core curriculum with program delivery adjusted for the level of the student
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS			More ESL resources available for a linguistic ability based ESL program	Increased LEP students have caused the school to create double periods of ESL and add "sheltered" English classes
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND/OR BILINGUAL EDUCATION		SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS EAST BAY MIDDLE SCHOOL	SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS L.A. METRO MIDDLE SCHOOL	
CONCEPT OF SERVICES		40 identified ESL students representing eleven different languages; No tutoring or instructional support in the student's primary language	To teach all limited English proficient students the core curriculum while mainstreaming them into English	
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		ESL students receive one period of ESL instead of an elective; not a well organized program directed at improving services for LEP students	Some bilingual Spanish content area courses offered; extra support with bilingual aide; close monitoring of students' English language acquisition skills	
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		ESL traveling teacher unable to meet with the regular content area teachers	Bilingual language arts and mathematics curriculum exactly the same as core curriculum; mixed pattern of Spanish language textbook alignment	
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS		Increase in number of ESL students resulting in more concern to meet the needs of these students	More formalized program to address the linguistic and academic needs of LEP students developed	

TABLE H4 A: DROP-OUT AND AT-RISK STUDENTS - HIGH SCHOOLS

1	2	3	4	5
POTENTIAL DROP-OUT/AT RISK STUDENT		BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS CAPITOL CITY HIGH SCHOOL	BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS L.A. CITY HIGH SCHOOL	BIG CITY URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS SOCAL HIGH SCHOOL
CONCEPT OF SERVICES		Integrating special populations into the regular program	To improve school climate & find alternative situations to meet needs of at-risk students by involving parents & staff in monitoring students	To identify at-risk students early & have counselors meet with students and parents
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED			Daily Attendance Certification Program; Individualized Contract; Student Study Team; Options Program; AB 65 Learning Complex Program	Monitor students throughout the year
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM			Supports the regular program	
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS			Development of attendance verification program with tighter monitoring & follow-up by parents & staff	
POTENTIAL DROP-OUT/AT RISK STUDENT		LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS DESERT HIGH SCHOOL	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS EAST BAY HIGH SCHOOL	LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS EAST BAY HIGH SCHOOL
CONCEPT OF SERVICES		To assist students in developing positive attitude about school while providing support services needed to help them meet the graduation requirements	No formal plan for the drop-out/at risk student	To accommodate the academic needs of at risk students by early identification and intervention strategies
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		Student Support Classroom conceived as a school within a school; optional before school program as an alternative to expulsion; peer counseling and Adopt-A-Student Program	No specific services offered; General school program is oriented towards the more academic student	Saturday School; Continuation School; ROP classes; District Comprehensive Guidance Program; Teen Mother Program; and Work experience program
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Supports the regular program	No formal program offered	Supports the regular program
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS		Newly developed intervention type programs to develop in students a positive attitude about school improve attendance	Consideration of a separate track of classes at the ninth grade for the 1987-88 school year	Development of a Guaranteed Comprehensive 7-12 Guidance Service Program; district has begun to collect data and monitor the drop-out/at-risk students
POTENTIAL DROP-OUT/AT RISK STUDENT		LARGE SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS PENINSULA HIGH SCHOOL	MEDIUM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS L.A. METRO HIGH SCHOOL	MEDIUM SUBURBAN HIGH SCHOOLS TRI-COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL
CONCEPT OF SERVICES		To provide instruction in skills students need for survival and success in high school	To achieve more student performance above the basic skills level; to provide alternative schooling environments which will aid in meeting the regular education program requirement	To provide alternative education programs that will encourage students to remain in school
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		All freshman take college career academic prep assistance class; opportunity class for 25 identified potential drop outs; Attendance Improvement Monitoring Program	District continuation school; adult education program; new Independent Study Program	Tenth grade counseling program; Alternative Educ. Program; Continuation School; Independent Study Program; County Gateway Program and Concurrent Education Program
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Supports the regular program	Supports the regular program	A committee formed to monitor the drop-out/ at risk students; intervention programs being implemented
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS		Funding & educational direction provided through the Packard Grant; District desegregation mandate has had an impact	Addition of the Independent Student Program	
POTENTIAL DROP-OUT/ AT RISK STUDENT		RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS BUFFALO BUTTE HIGH SCHOOL	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS CENTRAL VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL	RURAL HIGH SCHOOLS NORCAL HIGH SCHOOL
CONCEPT OF SERVICES		To employ various alternative strategies to keep students in school	To identify the "at-risk" student and provide alternative programs to keep them in school	No formalized program; Students not identified prior to 1985-86
SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED		Opportunity School on campus; Continuation School; flexible scheduling; close monitoring; tenth grade career education classes	Saturday school; Alternative Program; Health Careers Academy; and Independent Study	Student Study Team; tutoring; close monitoring by counselors
ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM		Program is less academically demanding but supports the regular program in basic skills development	Close articulation among teachers to promote an integration of skills with the regular program	Support services attempting to integrate students into the regular program
CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS		Expanded career education program using SB 813 monies; more time spent counseling students	Additional monitoring of students; new Alternative Program established in 1983	More awareness and accountability to identify and monitor "at-risk" students

TABLE H4 B: POTENTIAL DROP-OUT/AT-RISK STUDENTS - JUNIOR HIGH AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2					
3	POTENTIAL DROP-OUT/AT RISK STUDENT		URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	URBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS
4			CAPITOL CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	L.A. CITY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	SOCAL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
5	CONCEPT OF SERVICES				
6			No formal program as less that 5% of student body	To support identified students through	To identify students and formalize an intervention
7			identified as "at risk"	alternative programs	plan that includes parents and school personnel
8	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED				
9			Attempts to meet varying needs of students via	Program Assisting Students to Succeed (P.A.S.S.):	Opportunity School: on-site program for
10			grouping in language and math classes	pull-out after-school program for students who	behavior modification; "Bridging" classes
11				appear most self-motivated to improve	during the summer
12	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM				
13			No formal program	P.A.S.S. Program supports the regular program	Supports the regular program
14				through counseling and positive reinforcement	
15	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM IN THE				
16	LAST FOUR YEARS		Two period block of time for language skills/reading	Development of the P.A.S.S. Program over the	
17			allows more individualized approach	last two years	Awareness level of high risk students has
18					risen; attempts to address the issues through
19					"bridging" classes and Opportunity School
20					
21					
22					
23	POTENTIAL DROP-OUT/AT-RISK STUDENT		SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOLS	
24			EAST BAY JUNIOR HIGH	L.A. METRO MIDDLE SCHOOL	
25	CONCEPT OF SERVICES				
26			No formal program; high transiency rate	No formal Program	
27	SPECIFIC SERVICES OFFERED				
28					
29	ALIGNMENT WITH REGULAR PROGRAM				
30					
31	CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM IN THE				
32	LAST FOUR YEARS				
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					
73					
74					
75					
76					
77					
78					
79					
80					
81					
82					
83					
84					
85					
86					
87					
88					
89					
90					
91					
92					

Appendix I

Explanation for Outcomes

THE STORY OF CAP SCORE IMPROVEMENTS

The following is a comparison of schools with high reading and math CAP score gains (H-CAP) with those that had low reading and math CAP score gains (L-CAP) over the four year comparison period, 1983- 1987.

H-CAP schools include: Orange County HS, LA Metro HS, East Bay HS, and Desert HS. L-CAP schools include: LA City HS, Capitol City HS, Buffalo Butte, and Norcal. Other schools not included in this review are schools with mixed CAP score gains (reading or math being high and the other being low). These mixed CAP score gain schools (Central Valley HS, Peninsula HS, Tri-County HS, and Socal HS) will be examined in another summary report.

The review will be presented in two parts. Part 1 will look at the degree of development and implementation of each causal factor within the two sets of schools. Part 2 will examine causal factor patterns that exist across sites and within single sites. Causal factors are identified as "high", "moderate", or "low" depending on the degree to which the major and subcomponent parts have been developed and implemented These rating were taken from the individual causal factor sheets which were developed from a comprehensive analysis of the reports submitted by each data gatherer (State Policy Descriptions, Round One Case Studies, Round Two Case Studies, Causal Factor Sheets, and the Round Three Outcomes).

PART 1: CROSS SITE CAUSAL FACTOR PATTERNS FOR H-CAP AND L-CAP SCHOOLS

1. CAUSAL FACTOR G: IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT

COMPONENT PARTS	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-IMP MGT	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD	LOW	MOD
-CRTING	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW
-IMP PLAN	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	LW-MD	LOW	LOW

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + High frequency of high and moderate ratings for implementation management (IMP MGT) cross role teaming (CRTING), and implementation plan (IMP PLAN)
- + Ratings: 5/12 high; 6/12 moderate; 1/12 low
- + All but one (East Bay) had a high rating for a least one component
- + LA Metro had all three ratings in the high range.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + No high ratings and a high frequency of low ratings for overall implementation, cross role teaming, and implementation plan
- + Ratings: 0/12 high; 4/12 moderate or low-moderate; 8/12 low
- + No L-CAP school had a high rating.
- + Buffalo Butte had all three ratings in the low range.

2. CAUSAL FACTOR H: INITIAL TRAINING

COMPONENT PARTS	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-INT TRNG	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MOD	LOW	LOW	MOD
-ADM TRNG	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	MOD	LOW	LOW	MOD
-TCHR TRNG	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	MOD	LOW	LOW	MOD

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ High frequency of high ratings and some moderate and low ratings for overall initial training, training for administrators, and training for teachers.
+ Ratings: 6/12 high; 2/12 moderate; 4/12 low
+ Orange and LA Metro had all three ratings in the high range.
+ East Bay had all three ratings in the low range.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ No high ratings and a high frequency of low and moderate ratings for overall intitial training, training for administrators, and training for teachers
+ Ratings: 0/12 high; 6/12 moderate; 6/12 low
+ No L-CAP school had a high rating.
+ Capitol City and Buffalo Butte had all three ratings in the low range.

3. CAUSAL FACTOR J: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

COMPONENT PARTS	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-CURR DEVELP	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	HIGH	LOW	HIGH
-QUAL CHNG	LOW	MOD	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	MOD
-CURR ALNMT	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ High frequency of high ratings and some moderate and low ratings for curriculum development, qualitative curricular change, and curriculum alignment.
+ Ratings: 5/12 high; 4/12 moderate; 3/12 low

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ High frequency of ratings in both the high and the low range for curriculum development, qualititative curricular change, and curriculum alignment.
+ Ratings: 5/12 high; 2/12 moderate; 5/12 low
+ L-CAP schools had most of their high rating.(5/10) on this causal factor.
+ Buffalo Butte had all three ratings in the low range.
+ LA City and Capitol City received all of their high ratings (1/26 and 2/26 respectively) on this causal factor.

+ The incidence of a few high ratings for any one or a few causal factor does not appear to be sufficient for increasing CAP scores.

4. CAUSAL FACTOR K: ADMINISTRATIVE INTERVENTIONS

COMPONENT	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
PARTS	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-COMMITMT	HIGH	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	LOW	HIGH
-LEADERSHP	HIGH	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	LOW	HIGH
-PRESSURE	HIGH	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW
-MONITOR'G	HIGH	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ High frequency of high ratings for administrative interventions involving commitment, leadership, pressure, and monitoring.
+ Ratings: 10/16 high; 4/16 moderate; 2/16 low
+ All H-CAP schools had at least half of their ratings in the high range.
+ Orange had all four ratings in the high range.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ High frequency of low ratings for administrative interventions involving commitment, leadership, pressure, and monitoring.
+ Ratings: 2/16 high; 2/16 moderate; 12/16 low
+ All L-CAP schools had low ratings for administrative pressure and monitoring.
+ LA City and Buffalo Butte had all four ratings in the low range.
+ Norcal had two of its four ratings in the high range and the other two ratings were in the low range. This pattern matched the pattern for one of the H-CAP schools (Desert); however, the H-CAP school had high ratings in twice as many other areas (7/10 causal factors and 11/26 causal factor components) as the matching L-CAP school (3/10 causal factors and 5/26 causal factor components).

5. CAUSAL FACTOR L: PROGRAM LATITUDE AND FIDELITY

COMPONENT	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
PARTS	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-LATITUDE	MOD	LOW	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW
-FIDELITY	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	MOD	LOW	HIGH
-DIR OF CHNG	TP DN	TP DN	TP DN	MIXED	TP DN	MUTAL	BTM UP	NA
-COUPLING	TIGHT	TIGHT	TIGHT	TIGHT	LOOSE	LOOSE	TIGHT	TIGHT

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ H-CAP schools had three different patterns for latitude and fidelity that were combined with a general overall utilization of top down (TP DN) change process and tight coupling.
+ All H-CAP schools were tightly coupled between district and schools
+ 3/4 H-CAP schools had top-down change management. The one exception was Desert and it had a mix of top-down and bottom-up change management.
+ LA Metro and East Bay had matching ratings: low latitude, high fidelity, top

down change management, and tight coupling.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + L-CAP schools had different patterns for latitude, fidelity, direction of change, and coupling.
- + No L-CAP school had top down change with tight coupling.

6. CAUSAL FACTOR M: ONGOING ASSISTANCE

COMPONENT	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
PARTS	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-DIST ASST	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD	MOD
-SCHL ASST	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	MOD	LOW	LOW	MOD
-EXT AGENT	MOD	MOD	NA	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	NA
-INT AGENT	MOD	HIGH	MOD	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	MOD

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + High frequency of moderate ratings for ongoing assistance with a third of the ratings in the high range. East Bay could not be assessed on degree of effective use of External Linking Agent (EXT AGENT) because none was used.
- + Ratings: 5/16 high; 9/16 moderate; 1/16 low; 1/16 not applicable
- + LA Metro received 3/4 ratings in the high range.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + No high ratings and high frequency of ratings in the low range with some ratings in the moderate range.
- + Ratings: 0/16 high; 7/16 moderate; 8/16 low; 1/16 not applicable
- + Norcal did not receive a rating because Extenal Linking Agents were not used.
- + Capitol City received a low rating in all four areas of ongoing assistance.

7. CAUSAL FACTOR N: TEACHER EFFORT

COMPONENT	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
PARTS	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-TCHR EFFORT	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	MIXED	MIXED	MIXED	LOW	LOW

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ Half of the ratings in the high range and some in the moderate or mixed range.
+ Ratings: 2/4 high; 1/4 moderate; 0/4 low; 1/4 mixed
+ Desert was assigned a mixed rating because significant numbers of teachers were split in their effort to implement the reform, some showing high effort with others showing low and moderate effort.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ No ratings in the high or moderate range and half of the ratings in the low range and some ratings in the mixed range
+ Ratings: 0/4 high; 0/4 moderate; 2/4 low; 2/4 mixed
+ Buffalo Butte and Norcal. had ratings in the low range
+ LA City and Capital City had a mix of teacher effort

8. CAUSAL FACTOR P: TEACHER SKILL MASTERY

COMPONENT	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
PARTS	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-SKILL MASTRY	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LW-MOD	NA	MOD	LW-MOD

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ Half of the ratings in the high range and half in the low range.
+ Ratings: 2/4 high; 0/4 moderate; 2/4 low
+ Schools with high skill mastery(LA Metro and East Bay) also had high teacher effort.
+ Orange had one of its few low ratings for this causal factor. Orange had three of a total possible 26 ratings in the low range. The other two low ratings were for administrative pressure and low teacher commitment.
+ Desert also received one of its low ratings on this component. Desert had 8/26 of its ratings in the low range. While Desert had more low ratings than any of the other H-CAP schools, it had more high ratings than the combined total received by all L-CAP schools.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

+ No ratings in the high range, half of the ratings in either the low or the mixed range
+ Ratings: 0/4 high; 0/4 moderate; 2/4 mixed; 2/4 low
+ LA City and Norcal were schools that had a combination of causal factor characteristics that exemplified low configurations and moderate configurations.
+ Capitol City had not been assessed to date by the data gatherer for this causal

factor.

9. CAUSAL FACTOR Q: TEACHER COMMITMENT

COMPONENT	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
PARTS	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-TCHR COMMIT	LOW	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	MOD	LOW	LOW
-INST COMMIT	MOD	MOD	HIGH	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + High frequency of the ratings in the high range, and some in the moderate or low range for teacher commitment (TCHR COMMIT) and institutional commitment (INST COMMIT)
- + Ratings: 4/8 high; 3/8 moderate; 1/8 low
- + East Bay and Desert had all of their ratings in the high range.
- + Orange received one of its three low scores for this causal factor.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + No high ratings and the other ratings split between moderate and low ratings.
- + Ratings: 0/8 high; 4/8 moderate; 4/8 low
- + Buffalor Butte had all of its ratings in the low range.

10. CAUSAL FACTOR R: EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

COMPONENT	HIGH CAP GAIN SCHOOLS				LOW CAP GAIN SCHOOLS			
PARTS	ORANGE	LA MET	E. BAY	DESERT	LA CITY	CAPITOL	B. BUTTE	NORCAL
-OVERALL IMP	MOD	MD-HI	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD
-DIST IMP	MOD	MD-HI	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD
-SCHL IMP	MOD	MD-HI	MOD	HIGH	MOD	MOD	LOW	MOD

A. High CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + High frequency of high, moderate-high, or moderate ratings for overall extent of implementation, district implementation, and school implementation of the reform effort.
- + Ratings: 3/12 high; 3/12 moderate-high; 3/12 moderate
- + Desert achieved ratings in the high range for all three components.
- + LA Metro's moderate-high ratings reflect component characteristics in both the high and moderate range.

B. Low CAP gain schools are characterized by:

- + No ratings in the high range and high frequency of ratings in the moderate and low range.
- + Ratings: 0/12 high; 9/12 moderate; 3/12 low
- + Buffalo Butte had ratings in the low range for all components.

THE STORY OF IMPROVED ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY GAINS

The following report summarizes major findings of all twelve PACE-ACE senior high schools after schools had been ranked and assigned to groups based on gains in organizational capacity since 1983. Schools were assigned to one of three groups described as high gain, medium gain, or low gain, relative to differences in administrative practices and school climate.

Schools with high gains in organizational capacity were Desert, Orange County, Peninsula, and Central Valley High Schools. These schools received ratings indicating the greatest differences between 1983 and 1987 in administrative behavior and school climate outcomes. Schools with moderate gains in organizational capacity were LA Metro, Capitol City, Buffalo Butte, and Norcal High Schools. Low gain schools were East Bay, LA City, Tri County, and SoCal High Schools.

In order to identify specific patterns among the implementation factors, ratings were quantified. High ratings in implementation strategies were assigned a value of 3; moderate, 2; and low, 1. Combinations of low-moderate and moderate-high were assigned values of 1.5 and 2.5 respectively.

Factor G: Implementation Management

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Implementation Mngt	2.13 Moderate	2.0 Moderate	1.5 Low-Moderate
Cross-Role Teaming	2.63 High	1.5 Low-Mod	1.5 Low-Moderate
Implementation Plan	2.0 Moderate	1.63 Low-Mod	1.5 Low Moderate

In all aspects of implementation management, those schools identified as high gain indicated the greatest differences between 1983 and 1987. High gain schools were particularly strong in employing cross-role teams to develop implementation strategies. High gain schools also developed implementation strategies as well as had stronger implementation plans. Overall implementation management was strongest in high gain schools, but the difference between high gain and middle gain schools was least significant in comparing this specific strategy. Low gain schools were most consistent across all implementation management strategies receiving an averaged low-moderate ranking in all strategies.

Factor H: Initial Training

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Initial Training (Content, Skill, etc).	2.0 Moderate	1.75 Low-Mod	2.0 Moderate
Administrative Training	2.0 Moderate	1.75 Low-Mod	1.5 Low-Moderate
Teacher Training	1.75 Moderate	1.75 Low-Mod	2.0 Moderate

In examining the ratings for initial training there was little distinction between high gain and low gain schools. High gain schools did have stronger administrator training than either medium gain or low gain schools, but teacher training in high gain schools was lower than in low gain schools. As for as overall initial training, both high gain and low gain schools received a moderate rating. The most consistent ratings were assigned to medium gain schools which received low-moderate ratings in both administrator and teacher training and in overall initial training.

Factor J: Curriculum Development

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Curriculum Development	2.0 Moderate	2.5 High	2.25 Moderate
Qualitative Change	1.1 Low	1.5 Low-Mod	1.25 Low
Curriculum Alignment	2.5 High	2.5 High	2.5 High

In regard to curriculum development, the main conclusion is not so much that high gain, medium gain, and low gain schools are particularly different, but rather that there is consistency in all areas across all three groups. Interestingly, schools in the middle group received the highest ratings for qualitative change and overall curriculum development. All three groups were rated equally high as far as curriculum alignment is concerned. In terms of qualitative change, however, ratings are low to low-moderate. Finally, ratings for overall curriculum development range from moderate to high with high gain schools receiving the lowest rating of the three groups.

Factor K: Administrative Commitment

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Admin. Commitment	3.0 High	2.0 Moderate	2.25 Moderate
Leadership	2.88 High	2.0 Moderate	2.25 Moderate
Pressure	2.0 Moderate	1.5 Low-Mod	1.38 Low
Monitoring	1.67 Low-Mod	1.5 Low-Mod	1.38 Low

High gain schools received the highest ratings across all aspects of administrative commitment while ratings for medium gain and low gain schools are mixed. Administrative leadership ratings range from moderate to high with high gain schools receiving a very high rating. Administrative pressure ranges from low to moderate with high gain schools again receiving the highest rating and low gain schools the lowest rating. Administrative monitoring received the lowest rating across all three groups of schools and the narrowest range: 1.38 to 1.67. Ratings for overall administrative commitment ranged from moderate to high, and high gain schools received the highest possible average rating. Since schools were grouped on the basis of organizational capacity, high gain schools' high ratings perhaps are expected; the minimal distinctions between medium gain and low gain schools are perhaps more difficult to understand.

Factor L: Program Latitude and Fidelity

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Program Latitude	2.33 Moderate	1.5 Low-Mod	2.25 Moderate
Degree of Fidelity	1.67 Low-Mod	2.25 Moderate	2.0 Moderate

In analyzing program latitude and degree of fidelity, high gain schools received the highest rating for latitude and the lowest for degree of fidelity. Medium gain schools by contrast had the lowest rating for latitude and the highest for degree of fidelity. Low gain schools were rated as moderate in both areas.

Factor M: On-going Assistance

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Dist. Ongoing Asst.	1.25 Low	1.75 Low-Mod	1.75 Low-Mod
School Ongoing Asst.	2.0 Moderate	2.0 Moderate	1.5 Low-Mod
Ext. Linking Agent	2.5 High	1.33 Low	1.5 Low-Mod
Int. Linking Agent	2.33 Moderate	1.75 Low-Mod	1.5 Low-Mod

In analyzing the importance of on-going assistance, certain differences between high gain, medium-gain and low gain schools become readily apparent. This causal factor, however, was marked by the greatest number of low and low moderate ratings, 8 of a possible 12. With regard to District on-going assistance, high gain schools had the lowest rating, but the range of ratings for all three groups was narrow varying from low to low-moderate. School on-going assistance received somewhat stronger ratings with high gain and medium gain schools receiving a moderate rating. Ratings on the use of External Linking Agents indicate high gain schools had a high rating; low gain schools have a low-moderate rating; moderate gain schools have a low rating. As to the use of Internal Linking Agents, high gain schools receive a strong moderate rating while both medium gain and low gain schools receive low moderate ratings. Low gain schools are most consistent with low-moderate ratings across all components of on-going assistance. Medium gain schools have mixed ratings, primarily low to moderate. High gain schools also have mixed ratings but these are higher than those for medium gain schools.

Factor N: Teacher Effort

	High Gain Schools	Mediuim Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Teacher Effort	2.33 Moderate	1.75 Low-Mod	2.5 High

In analyzing the ratings for teacher effort, low gain schools received the highest average rating, followed by high gain schools with a strong moderate rating. Mediuim gain schools receive a low-moderate rating. In schools which ranked low relative to organizational capacity, it appears that implementation strategies may be significantly more teacher-driven.

Factor P: Teacher Skill Mastery

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Sc
Teacher Skill Mastery	1.67 Low Mod	1.83 Low-Mod	2.83 High

In analyzing ratings relative to teacher skill mastery, low gain schools were significantly higher than either high gain or medium gain schools which both received a low-moderate rating. Again, as with teacher effort, skill mastery may be rrelated to the fact that in low gain schools teachers must assume greater responsibility for implementation strategies.

Factor Q: Commitment

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Teacher Commitment	2.33 Moderate	1.5 Low-Mod	2.0 Moderate
Institutional Commitment	2.67 High	1.75 Low-Mod	2.25 Moderate

In examining teacher commitment, high gain schools received a rating of strong moderate; low gain schools, a moderate; medium gain schools, a low-moderate. In terms of institutional commitment high gain schools received a high rating; low gain schools a moderate rating; mediuim gain schools a low-moderate rating. It is significant that across all three groups approximately the same difference exists between institutional commitment and teacher commitment, and in each case institutional commitment was rated more strongly than teacher commitment. This remains consistent across all three groups of schools.

Factor R: Extent of Implementation

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Ext. of Implementation	2.67 High	1.88 Low-Mod	2.33 Moderate
Dist. Implementation	2.67 High	1.88 Low-Mod	2.33 Moderate
School Implementation	2.67 High	1.88 Low-Mod	2.33 Moderate

In analyzing the extent of implementation, the most important singular finding is the consistency which occurs among all groups across all components. High gain schools receive a consistently strong high rating across all components and low gain schools received a strong moderate rating across all components. Medium gain schools receive a low-moderate rating, significantly lower than the rating received by the other two groups.

Degree of CAP Test Emphasis

	High Gain Schools	Medium Gain Schools	Low Gain Schools
Deg. of CAP Test Emph.	3.0 High	2.0 Moderate	1.25 Low

In comparing the degree of CAP test emphasis, it is readily apparent that ratings correspond almost exactly with the organizational capacity of each group. The consistency of high, moderate, and low ratings with high gain, medium gain, and low gain schools reflects accurately the degree of emphasis placed on CAP testing.

Other comparative areas which did not lend themselves to quantification are also of interest. Across all three groups some schools had SIP programs; others did not. A mixed response characterized all three groups. Most schools in the study had other programs - 551, 63, 803, etc., in place. All high gain schools did; .5 of medium gain schools did; .75 of low gain schools did. In examining questions of court ordered voluntary integration, the specific type of change (top-down, bottom-up, etc.) and the degree of organizational coupling, responses were mixed across all areas. Finally, in response to the question about increased centralization in all high gain schools this had occured; in 2 medium gain schools increased centralization had occured while for 2 others no change was indicated; in 3 low gain schools increased centralization had occured while in one no change was observed. No schools reported to have experienced decreased centralization.